The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

WRITING on Sept. 7th words to be read a fortnight later, after what may be the two most critical weeks of the war, comment is very difficult. Stalingrad holds out but Novorossiisk seems to have fallen, and it is not beyond German ingenuity to render the Caucasus useless even as it did the Maginot line. The defence of Egypt holds, but defence is not enough, for it almost looks as if the first step towards Allied victory is the clearing of North Africa and the recovery of the control of the Mediterranean. The situation in the Pacific has not worsened during the quarter, and the marvellous Chinese have even made some gains.

No doubt Allied strategy is piling up material for a gigantic blow somewhere, but it must not be delayed much longer. The people of the democracies have shown remarkable patience during the summer; and it is to be hoped that the confidence they have placed in the leadership of the United Nations will not be disappointed. The patience has been a real triumph for democracy, and in itself encourages the belief that the peoples will also possess the endurance necessary before we are at the end of the tunnel. It is clear that "reserves" will determine the issue of the war, and we believe that in morale the reserves of free peoples are infinitely greater than those of totalitarian States.

* * *

THE old lady said she did not know whether she agreed with the Ten Commandments, because they put ideas into people's heads! But does not war experience suggest that a great many people in so-called Christian countries have not yet reached the moral level of the Commandments? The hotel-keeper who said of his staff recently, "They are all stealing", the lies and evasions of shopkeepers (and customers), and all the "under the counter" business —these and a hundred and one other daily experiences suggest that honesty and truthfulness are but lightly regarded. The workman who, even in wartime, does as little as he can for as much, the employer who dodges the Excess Profits Tax—we heard the astounding statement the other day from one in a position to know that today there are 300 professional men in London engaged in nothing else but in discovering ways to evade or escape the Tax—all these are disquieting in a nation avowedly engaged in a war for moral ends. We hope the number of employee-slackers and

employer-dodgers is grossly exaggerated; it probably is; but it is at any rate obvious that the simple virtues are far from universal, while even when men are dying in thousands, thousands more are simply out for themselves: they have no sense of personal responsibility; it is not for *them* to save coal, or light, or paper; they will get all the food or fuel they can, and do as little as possible, their selfishness being thrown into high relief by the sacrifices of others. Have we then to begin again at the bottom after the war, and teach "simple morality"? Or are we being shown that there can be no morality without religious faith, that men will not be honest, truthful, and unselfish unless and until they believe in a God of justice, truth, and love?

* * *

Dr. William Brown states a truth of profound importance when he remarks "there is anti-Semitism in this country, and it may grow". Why is it that both here and in the United States there is a growing suspicion and dislike of Jews? A few months ago in a Pullman car between New York and Montreal a passenger whose lips had been loosened by liquor suddenly rose and indulged himself in a tirade against the Jews, whom he accused as being the cause of all the world's ills; on which Dr. W. E. Orchard, another passenger, shrewdly commented, "The trouble is that he is only speaking out aloud in his cups what thousands of Americans are thinking and saying one to another when they are sober". It seems an immediate duty for Jews and Christians to get to the bottom of this situation. Is there even now in Allied countries propaganda at work to stigmatize the Jews? Or is there any ground for the frequent assumption that there are certain practices, even crimes, to which the Jews are more prone than others? We do well to recognize that if a black-market offender is a Gentile the fact is never mentioned, but if he be a Jew the fact is blazoned to the world. He is denounced not as anti-social and a law-breaker, but because he is a Jew. Yet it is absolutely certain that the immediate reaction of many readers to these words will be: "Yes, but—", and there will follow general statements about Jewish history and Jewish traits. Cannot the leaders of the Jewish community—and if they think well to invite some leaders of the Christian community to join them so much the better—form a fact-finding Commission to discover (*a*) whether there is any ground for these charges, and if so what steps can be taken to effect a remedy, or (*b*) whether they are the result of Nazi or other propaganda, and if so how it can be countered? It is no good fighting the persecutors of Jewry in Europe only to find that anti-Semitism has entrenched itself within the democracies.

* * *

THERE is much that cannot be defended in the story of British imperialism, and in the political and economic exploitation of India there are episodes for which we must needs be ashamed. It is a mistake, however, to let it be assumed that there are no entries on the credit side, a mistake which still has unfortunate consequences in the United States. *World Dominion* has done good service in printing articles by Sir Alfred Watson, formerly Editor of the Calcutta *Statesman,* and the Rev. Alexander McLeish, in which attention is drawn to the benefits conferred upon the people of India under the British *Raj*. Sir Alfred notes the huge increase in India's population as a result of

> the reduction of all those checks upon increase—war, famine, pestilence, and disease—that, through the centuries, had devastated India.

He notes that now there are more Indians than Europeans in the Indian Civil Service, that of 6,000 men in the Indian Medical Department less than 200 are British, and of 2,500 judges only 250 are British. These figures will perhaps be more enlightening to American critics of "British imperialism" than the 42,000 miles of railways, the reduction in the death rate in fifty years from 31 to 23 per 1,000, or even than the fact that next year India will

> not only have repatriated the whole of the sterling debt that has been incurred in her internal development, but will have passed into the ranks of the creditor countries.

Even where British rule is blameworthy, such as in the continued and widespread illiteracy, recent years have seen a transformation. That 88 per cent of the people are still illiterate is a matter for shame, but ten years ago the figure was 93, so that a decade has seen striking progress.

* * *

MR. DOUGLAS REED often loses his temper, but it is well—sometimes—to be angry. And who will quarrel with these paragraphs in *All Our Tomorrows*?:

> A fantastic story! On the one hand, the swift and stealthy armament of predatory nations; on the other, the implacable delusion of the British people. "This doesn't concern you, don't listen to the jitterbugs, go home and sleep peacefully in your beds, we shall not allow a new era of militarist aggression, it would be midsummer madness to interfere with militarist aggression, it's all a long way away in countries we know nothing about, we must guarantee those more distant countries which we know still less about, Germany is defenceless, Germany is building huge armaments, and we are building even mightier armaments—smash, crash, bang, War, We Are Unready, Unarmed, Dunkirk!"
>
> The British people never gets what it expects, is told to

> expect, and has a right to expect. It fights a war for lasting peace, and gets another war. It fights for democracy, and finds itself moving ever further away from democracy. It elects a Government to save the gold standard, whatever that may be, and the gold standard promptly vanishes. It elects another to strangle aggression and save Abyssinia; Abyssinia immediately dies and aggression thrives. It cheers Munich, because it is told that this will mean peace in our time, and is called up soon after for a new war.

* * *

PERHAPS the most important news in the papers today was the report, hidden in a tiny paragraph, that from Nov. 1 the manufacture of spirits is to cease in the United States, except for war purposes. We are not certain, for perhaps this only means the concentration of the manufacture in Britain: certainly on one journey across the Atlantic the only cargo our vessel carried was Scotch whisky. *If* some such control is being established on the manufacture and sale of intoxicants it will be a sign that at last the United Nations are taking the war seriously. So far intoxicants have been sacrosanct. Lord Woolton, who is successfully performing a most difficult job, rations milk—we beg his pardon, apparently milk is not "rationed" but something else—and slaughters chickens, but dare not touch beer. In Canada and the United States the same story is to be told: timidity in face of the liquor interests, and the belief that the working man will stand anything and everything except interference with his drink.

Dr. E. M. Howse, of Westminster Church, Winnipeg, the first church to organize the despatch of "bundles for Britain", recently preached an outspoken sermon on "Our National Scandal". He described the immense difficulty of getting space at all for parcels of food and clothing for Britain: they could not be sent except via Vancouver. And yet during last winter,

> one Canadian brewery secured space for 19,000,000 bottles of beer and further boasted that during this war the brewers of Canada had secured cargo space for sufficient beer to fill a train of box cars fifty miles long.

Dr. Howse goes on to say that essential war supplies for Canadians in Hong Kong were sent on a slow boat and did not arrive in time, while beer was given space on fast ships.

And here is what *The Christian Advocate* says about the situation in the United States:

> The tire rationing board at Sacramento, Cal., decided that it was more important to deliver beer to the stores than to deliver milk to the homes. At least that is the only interpretation that can be put on their action in refusing rubber for milk trucks and granting it to beer trucks. One board member

said: "That's the way the Federal Government wants it done".

According to the rulings of the Government, a vehicle that delivers goods to a retailer is classified as a wholesaler's truck and is entitled to tires. But a milk wagon or a bakery wagon that delivers milk and bread to homes and hospitals is a "retailer's delivery wagon", and on the theory that people can carry their own purchases from the grocery, such vehicles are denied tires.

Those who are close to the scene in Washington know that a powerful lobby there represents the brewing industry and that this lobby long ago sold the Government on the idea that "beer is food". On the basis that it is non-intoxicating, and has food value . . . the brewers have been granted prior rights again and again.

* * *

WHEN we consider the place which the Fourth Gospel has—and rightly—in the life and thought of Christians and of the Church, it is well to remember with what difficulty it succeeded in establishing itself. In an article in the April *Harvard Theological Review* which shows great promise, Mr. Robert M. Grant has compiled some interesting statistics showing the number of quotations or allusions made by the Fathers and other second-century writers to the Synoptics, on the one hand, and to *John* and *1 John*, on the other. Omitting Justin's 170 references to the Synoptics to his single reference to *John*, there are in 15 other writers approximately 43 references to the Synoptics and only 10 to *John*. Those Christians who today are so anxious to put bounds to the Spirit's guidance of the Church, and to say the sum and substance of the Christian faith was fully determined and expressed in the days of the Primitive Church, in the time of Ignatius, at the General Councils, by the *Institutes* or the Westminster Confession, or in 1833 or 1942, would do well to ponder the fact that there was long hesitation about matters they deem central to the faith, and that many beliefs once deemed essential are now entirely discarded.

* * *

WE trust there has been progress since Bishop Henson wrote these words in his Journal on the 9th Sunday after Trinity, 1918:

> The collect for this Sunday is again one of the best, just precise enough for individual use, yet so general that a congregation can adopt it. *"Grant to us, Lord, we beseech Thee, the spirit to think and do always such things as be rightful; that we, who cannot do anything that is good without Thee, may by Thee be enabled to live according to Thy will; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen"*. Contrast this prayer with the long and stilted improvisations to which one listens with almost physical anguish on occasions when "our Nonconform-

> ist brethren" join us in some public service. It is not conflicting dogmata which keep us apart, but inbred divergences of religious taste and habit. The Nonconformist finds our monotoned prayers little more than a meaningless babble; the Anglican finds their extemporaneous outpourings a well-nigh intolerable profanation. Apart, they can be wondrously fraternal: in actual contact, they could assassinate one another! This complicates the problem of Re-union very considerably, for our venturous efforts to bring the two parties together are apt to have the untoward effect of increasing their mutual disgust! We are actually driven to cherish isolation as the mother of civility, and of all other harmonious tempers! What a paradox!

* * *

THE World Conference on Faith and Order has just issued the Report of the American section of the Commission on Intercommunion. The Commission naturally has to report that its members

> are not in full agreement as to the place of either intercommunion or open communion in the practice of the Ecumenical Movement,

but it goes on to suggest certain principles as "a step in the way of a progressive realization of full fellowship in Christ", these to apply, of course, only "within the bounds of the Ecumenical Movement".

The value of this Report, as of most of the work the Conference has done so far, lies in the collection of information about the views and the practice of the constituent Churches. In this Report the American section tabulates the answers to a questionnaire arranged first under denominations, and next under the questions *seriatim*, in a way that facilitates reference.

In reading the Report we were impressed by:

1. The general acceptance of the dominical institution of the Lord's Supper: we think we are right in saying that no Church mentions the fact that many scholars doubt this, and more have doubts whether Jesus intended perpetual observance of the Supper, especially in view of the great variety of form it has assumed.
2. The growth of the practice of "open communion", with the invitation to members of other Churches, or even to "all who love the Lord Jesus Christ".
3. This only throws into relief the rigidity of some of the Churches, but even the Lutheran Church, with its generally accepted rule, "Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran ministers only. Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants only", goes on to mention exceptions "by the conscientious judgment of pastors as the cases arise".

4. The most extreme example of this rigidity is in the Presbyterian Church of America's answer to the question whether others than ordained ministers can administer the Sacrament: "Under no circumstances whatever". We are glad to note that the United Church of Canada emphasizes the hardships this would entail on Christians in "a Home Mission Church . . . covering . . . enormous areas". Presbyterians must think again.

But while more or less theoretical discussions about union seem to arrive at an *impasse,* the march of events is leaving them far behind. The Churches are growing into union and co-operation almost despite themselves, and association in all kinds of work and worship is removing all manner of misunderstandings. Sermons like that of the Bishop of Lichfield at the Tercentenary of Lion Walk Church, Colchester, and addresses like that of the present Chairman of the Congregational Union over the air, are signs of the new spirit and pointers to the way ahead. We know all about the differences between Christians, and do not minimize them, but on many vital matters, especially on the need of men for Christ's Gospel, we are agreed; let Christians work together here, and they will be led into a path forward from which no retreat will be needed.

* * *

Mr. A. L. Rowse has forsaken the Church; he "loathes" Protestantism and despises Modernism; he calls himself "a High Church unbeliever", and says, "The Church of England is the church I don't go to". This type is well-known even in the Nonconformity at which Mr. Rowse constantly sneers; most readers of these pages know people who appear in church only at baptisms, weddings, and funerals, and maybe anniversaries. There comes to mind a Lancashire street in the last war, with a woman complaining that her soldier-son is not receiving parcels from the church. To the minister's query, "But does he come to church?" she makes the reply, "Oh, no, he doesn't come. But he belongs to th' Independents. The —— have allus belonged to th' Independents". How far a critic loses the right to criticize an institution he has forsaken is a moot point, but it is right to learn even from such an enemy as Mr. Rowse, and we are disposed to think that the Church would do well to heed his contention that in Church and State alike the determination of the old to cling to power has resulted in disaster. The particular instance which was the occasion of his leaving the Church

> meant that there was not much of a younger generation to take the place of the old in the way they were determined to have things; and so the institution has slid downhill out of inanition and for want precisely of the vitality of those younger

men whom they thought they could ignore or even safely antagonize.

Speaking of the old he goes on:

> Since they possessed all the means of power, if they were determined to hold on, let them do so and find that they were grasping a skeleton. Subsequently, in the infinitely more important field of politics, that same determination of the old to hold on to power at all costs I found to be the dominating factor in the twenty years between the last war and this: the reason for the decline in vitality, enthusiasm, belief, achievement in this disgraceful period—the worst in our history since that which lost us America.

Here we are concerned with the truth of this criticism in regard to the Church. Is there any other institution—whether we think of its local, national, or universal manifestations—where the old play such a part and are so loth to relinquish power and office? The Churches do well to be proud of their veterans, and it will be an ill day when they cease to esteem them for their services and value their achievements, but men of religion are no more immune from the assaults of time than men of business. It is perhaps natural that we assume we are exceptions and possess to old age the vitality and acumen of a Gladstone or a Halley Stewart, but such men are rare, and the consensus of opinion in every sphere of life is that an age for retirement is wise. It is in the local community, perhaps, that the Church suffers most, and there the lack of a younger generation determined to struggle for its share of power makes the decay of churches almost inevitable. Therefore while we gladly rejoice in our "octo-geraniums", as one witty minister called a veteran D.D. "resplendent in his scarlet gown", we must see that youth has a due place. Take any enterprise you will, from the Early Church to the Early Separatists, the Pilgrim Fathers to the eras of missionary expansion, and one of its most impressive features will be the part played by those under 35. In the light of this it is interesting to note that the average age of Congregationalism's "Young People's Committee" must be fifty.

Since writing this paragraph we have "made up" this issue, and found that we have testified to our regard for age by including quite a number of the veterans! At the same time we have noted that Bishop Hensley Henson said in his Journal in 1919 that resignation is "a grace more often admired than practised". He points out how most men, when their time comes to retire, find reason why they are exceptions, and renew in their own persons the very abuse they have spent their lives in denouncing, and coins the salutary epigram:

> We are all revolutionaries in youth, reformers in middle age, and abuses in our senility!

* * *

We have before us a most encouraging report of the progress of the Reconstruction Movement prepared by the Commissioner. Mr. Glassey and the Rev. John Smith have gathered round them a fine body of local Commissioners, ministerial and lay, and already the response to their efforts has been stimulating. While organization is further advanced in some districts than in others, it is clear that the challenge has generally been accepted, and that it has fired the imagination of many churches. Tacket Street, Ipswich, made a staggering response by promising £5,600; Somerset has already reached its quota, while mention is made of churches with 9 and 34 members sending or promising £53 and £120 respectively. And there are many indications of the determination of the churches to see that there is more in the Movement than the raising of a large sum of money for the erection of buildings.

* * *

We have long deplored the mutual ignorance of American and British Congregationalists of each others' history: the average Congregational minister in England would be hard put to it to secure even a *gamma* in an examination on Congregationalism in America from 1630 to 1900! It was therefore with satisfaction we heard that two Congregational ministers, held in high esteem and great affection by their brethren in the United States, were at work on a *History of American Congregationalism*. It is now before us (Pilgrim Press, $2.00, an amazingly cheap book), and it goes a long way to meet a need. Dr. Gaius Glenn Atkins is as well-known as preacher, teacher, and writer as Dr. F. L. Fagley is as administrator and big brother; thus we have inspiration in the first part of the book and information in the second—with, of course, some overlapping! The Appendixes, with the extracts from Covenants and Declarations, and the Bibliography are specially useful. Dr. Atkins's flashes of insight and pawky humour are a feature of his chapters, while Dr. Fagley's account of the life of organized Congregationalism during the last century will often be used for reference. A list of hymns by American Congregationalists, supplied by Prof. H. H. Tweedy, adds to the book's value.

We propose to deal with the volume at greater length and to offer some criticisms in the next issue of the *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*. Here we merely commend it to the notice of our readers: it should find a place in every College Library and on the shelves of all interested in denominational history.

* * *

Our readers will be glad to have for themselves—and to present to others as an example of what Congregational lay preaching can be—a volume of the late Bernard Manning's sermons and

addresses. Published under the title *A Layman in the Ministry* (Independent Press, 6s.), the volume contains nineteen sermons, and good preaching they are. Of course we do not suggest that Bernard Manning was a typical Congregational lay preacher, or that sermons like these would be heard whenever a Congregational layman occupied the pulpit. Manning was entirely *sui generis*, and there was a distinctive touch about everything he did. Here we have that deep respect for the Christian ministry, the fruit of wide knowledge and of affection for his own father; that insistence on the great doctrines of the Christian faith and on worship which should express them; and that plea for the dedicated life, of which he himself was so shining an example.

Manning was at his best in *ad hoc* addresses, of which the last two items in this volume are admirable illustrations: "Effectual Preaching: The Reflexions of One Hearer" is an Annual Address delivered at the United College, Bradford; and we still remember the effect of the "Charge to the Church" delivered at an Ordination. The incisiveness of Manning's style, his glowing sincerity, and the strength of his convictions, tested as they were by his wide reading and profound meditation on the things of the Spirit, all made him a preacher of unusual power.

The selection of these sermons has been made by the Rev. H. C. Carter, of Cambridge. The next issue of the *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society* will contain Mr. Carter's tribute to Manning paid at the Society's Annual Meeting and also the Rev. A. G. Matthews's address on "Bernard Manning as Historian".

* * *

THERE are some things for which Methodism is to be envied—John Wesley's *Journal* and Charles Wesley's Hymns among them; and the *Methodist Recorder*, though we do wish that occasionally, say once a year, there might be some indication in its pages that there are other Christians in the world than Methodists! At the moment, however, we are thinking of Methodism's Lectures, the Fernley-Hartley and the Beckly, by which many distinct contributions have been made to religious thought. This year's Lectures are exceedingly good—Dr. A. W. Harrison's on *The Evangelical Revival and Christian Union* (Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.)—not a good title—and the Rev. E. C. Urwin's on *Religion in Planned Society* (Epworth Press, 4s. & 3s.), though both scholars are rather "wonky" on names and titles. We say that Dr. Harrison's is not a good title because the last chapter, an outspoken and suggestive discussion of "Steps toward Reunion", has little relevance to the history of the Revival and its consequences which occupies the rest of the book. Dr. Harrison has exceptionally able chapters on "Doctrine" and "Personalities", and is weakest on "The Re-

vival and Dissent'': it is often the case that the glowing successes of the Wesleys and Whitefield obscure the sober witness of the older Dissenters.

Mr. Urwin's essay is both timely and stimulating. A planned society is a certainty of the future, he emphasizes. What has religion to say in regard to it? What place will religion have in it? Will it be possible for the individual and for the Church to be free in such a society, and can that society realize its end without religion? Crucial questions, on the answers to which much depends.

The existence of these Lectureships has given to the world two more useful volumes. Can Congregationalism not take a leaf out of Methodism's book here? We should be glad to hear from two Congregationalists—or three—willing to found Lectureships of this kind.

The sudden death of Bernard Manning frustrated our plans for a review of last year's Fernley-Hartley Lecture, Dr. J. E. Rattenbury's *The Evangelical Doctrine of Charles Wesley's Hymns*. A day or two before his death Mr. Manning wrote to say that his review was almost ready, but it could not be found among his papers.

Another Methodist book which has given us much pleasure is the centenary volume, *Didsbury College* (Epworth Press, 6s.), to which many *alumni* contribute under the editorship of Principal W. Bardsley Brash and Dr. C. J. Wright.

* * *

A CORRESPONDENT asks if we cannot say something about ministerial stipends and fees. We gladly respond, for though we maintain that the Christian ministry should not be limited to a professional, full-time ministry, those who *are* giving the whole of their time to the work should be relieved from financial anxiety. It is a fact that in recent years the tendency has been for stipends to go down even while prices, and especially taxation, have gone up. Rarely, if ever, does a church invite a minister at the same, to say nothing of a larger, stipend than was paid to his predecessor. Rarely do deacons stop to consider that income tax now begins at a much lower level, and that the minister with £300 a year today has a considerably smaller net income than his predecessor with £300 ten years ago. Fees too have been reduced, and it is to be feared that many retired men, looking to fees for additions to the meagre superannuation allowance, are sadly disappointed. Even those churches who pay a fee of three, four, or five guineas do not stop to consider that often when travelling expenses and tax have been paid sometimes half, or less than half, is all that is left.

* * *

Two more correspondents write on another point—the lack of Free Church Chaplains in hospitals. Both have been patients recently, one of them in more than one large hospital; while Roman Catholic and Anglican clergy have often been in evidence, there has been no sign of a Congregational minister. Are Free Churchmen as alive as they should be to this means of service?

* * *

From Scotland:

1. A woman in Glasgow with the queue mania joined every queue she saw. The result is that she has recently been vaccinated sixteen times.
2. This seems incredible even for a Government Department. A farmer was ordered to plough up more land. When he said it was impossible, the Department insisted. He replied that owing to shortage of labour it could not be done during lambing-time, whereupon he was instructed to put off lambing-time!

* * *

From Miss Blaydon's *Cyril Bardsley* we take these items:

A travel agency's notice in Japan:
"Passengers' luggages scattered in all directions".

A Japanese Hospital:
"This hospital harbours all diseases and respects no religions".

A Bishop's wife (we hope apocryphal):
"I feel so anxious when my husband goes to take confirmations lest he should be put in a damp bed. I do wish we had a suffragan".

* * *

With this number the *Congregational Quarterly* ends its 20th year, with gratitude to all who have subscribed to it through thick and thin, through peace and war, and been patient and long-suffering with the editor and his vagaries. We wish we could report that we were sailing into harbour with a profitable cargo; but for nearly all periodicals such cargoes ceased with the war, with the inevitable decrease in circulation and increase in costs. Not until we recover the 150 to 200 subscribers lost through bombing and evacuation shall we be able to get again on to an even keel.

That we hope we shall be able to accomplish before handing over to a new editor. Twenty years, we said long ago, was long enough for any man to occupy an editorial chair. For 76 of the 80 issues we have had entire responsibility. When another year has passed we shall have given to the journal a full twenty years of service, and then the time must not be far distant when the denomination must look for a successor. By then we hope peace will be with us—and prosperity.

The Index for 1942 can be had on application to the publishers.

AGNOSTICISM DUE FOR RETIREMENT

By the Rev. A. Norman Rowland, M.A.

"Let us consider through what clouds, and how blindfold, we are led to the knowledge of most things that pass our hands".

Montaigne.

There is a minority of young fellows and girls who find the Christian help they need through Catholicism or the Group Movement, in social service, or in other ways, but there is another minority for whom the difficulty is to fit the faith they hold into a philosophy of life, to make it a working partner with their mental outlook on the universe. Born into an atmosphere that is impregnated with a vague "science" they grow up to find the tender plant of faith wilting under its acid influence. Prof. C. E. M. Joad wrote[1] only last year (1941):

> There has grown to maturity a generation which is to all intents and purposes without religious belief—to whom it is a matter of no interest whether life has a point, the universe a purpose or not. . . I recently questioned a class of 20 students. . . . Only 3 said they were Christians, 8 had never thought of it one way or the other, while the remaining 9 were belligerently anti-Christian.

Making all allowance for the period of youth, when cleverness is over-valued, no one who recalls our history or hopes for our national future can be unperturbed by the prospect of our educated classes being hostile to the Christian faith or indifferent to human aims. They have evidently been affected by an argument, in the air though seldom expressed, that shelters under the specious modesty of agnosticism:

> If science can account for Nature, including human nature, what place is there for the supernaturalness of Christ, what chance for man's hope of rising above the "natural" and overcoming the world?

This is the line of thought that is implicit if not suggested in all the humanistic writers of our time[2]. But must it remain the keynote of our tertiary education (if I may coin the expression)?

It has recently been announced that army officers of a certain age are to be re-examined as to their actual worth and superseded if their value does not correspond to their rank. In the service of our mental life still more there needs to be an overhaul of dominant

[1] *Philosophy for our Times*, 12.

[2] "Behind the sceptical theories of modern thinkers there lie concealed all kinds of positive ideas of value, partly of a vitalistic nature, and partly idealistic and humanistic" (Emil Brunner, *The Divine Imperative*, 570).

ideas, to consider afresh their use for our own day. My suggestion in this article is that Agnosticism is a mental attitude or fashion whose retirement is now overdue.

As one looks back 40 years to the beginning of this century, with all its social improvements and increased liberties, one is conscious also of a general waywardness in things of the mind and spirit. Words that used to seem tiresome from their constant repetition in the Order for Morning Prayer have somehow become sharply relevant: "Forty years long have I been grieved with this generation and said It is a people that do err in their hearts for they have not known My ways".

This is a day of crisis, not in military and economic fields alone. If we are to stand firm for the Christian *ethos,* which is our hope for the full development of personality and the free federation of the world, there is desperate need of a clearer understanding and more candid presentation of the faith which is its secret. And that can only be done by building a bridge, however slender the material, between what is inwardly known and what is outwardly proved, so that (to anticipate the gist of the following pages), on the one hand, scientific conclusions can be happily accepted, minus their philosophic corollaries, and, on the other, Christian belief can be confidently held, but frankly sifted from its sub-Christian accretions.

We shall agree that it is too late to shore up the superstructure of Christianity with traditional ceremonies and repetitions—hymns that recall the isolationism of the Hanoverian age, prayers with the mental outlook and social perspective of the days of Good Queen Bess, observances suited to the notions of a Sicilian peasant or an Indian *peon.* At the parish church I attended on the Sunday before Easter, 1941, the priest focused the hour of worship on prayers that supernatural virtue might be imparted to a collection of palm-fronds twisted crosswise

> that into what places so-ever these branches may be brought the dwellers therein may obtain Thy blessing and every adversity be driven away.

By such diversions of religion from living thought the impression spreads more widely than ever that its advance has become a retreat, and that it involves a sheer withdrawal from all revelation given to our day[3]. But surely what we really need[4] is a straightforward philosophy of life in which the truth given to this generation is married to the experience known in every generation, "that

[3] In the serious Press last winter one champion of Christian faith identified the outbreak of evil with the publication of Darwin's theory, another (a Bishop) advocated as the ladder to religious learning the opportunity on Feast Days of beholding the Bishop on his throne.

[4] "What we expect from philosophy today is reflexion on those permanent values which have their foundation in a higher spiritual reality, above the changing interests of the times" (Windelband, quoted by Inge, *God and the Astronomers,* 174).

mind and heart according well may make one music as before, but vaster".

It is worth while reminding ourselves that the Christian faith of early days won its way against the intellectual and religious forces of the Roman Empire not only by the charity, hope, and courage of the rank and file but by the work of two supreme thinkers—St. Paul of the Epistles and St. John of the Gospel, who together built up a theory and valuation of God and man, with Christ for the corner-stone. Not that they set themselves to this task conjointly, or consciously as philosophers might do. They were possessed and used, as in other fields a Mozart, a Milton, or a Michael Angelo were possessed and used[5], by a Spirit that was "more than they". First St. Paul released the faith of his fathers from legalist and nationalist accretions, revealing its burning significance for living thought and human needs[6]. Equally as a free citizen of the Empire and in the same spirit of understanding he dealt with Roman Stoicism and Greek Mysticism, flooding them too with the Christian values of personality and so fulfilling them[7]. Then, using the best that came from two rival worlds of thought, the Apostle showed that the questions raised by both were met in the person of Jesus the Christ who "reconciled them both unto God".

The Apostle always exulted in this masterpiece of the Spirit of Jesus, whereby Eurasian philosophy could be interlocked with Israel's religion, and Jew and Gentile alike be at home in a temple built with no barrier and without hands (*cf. Eph.* $2^{11\text{-}22}$).

The material assembled by the master-builder was sifted and sublimated by St. John (Architect of the Upper Room, as he may be called). "Manifold wisdom" was transmuted into singlefold vision, the profound and pleading arguments of Paul turned into a sacramental interpretation of the universe through Christ the Mediator of things eternal. Thus in the manner of a Gothic arch two stresses of thought—the Hebraic and the Hellenic—with Christ for the keystone were enabled to sustain for many centuries the superstructure of Western civilization. And my thesis is that the *Modern* World or New Age, which contains both East and West,

[5] "No productiveness of the highest kind, no remarkable discovery, no great thought that bears fruit is in the power of anyone. . . . Man must consider them as an unexpected gift from above, as pure children of God, which he must receive and venerate with joyful thanks" (*Conversations of Goethe with Eckermann,* 310).

[6] Re *Law Rom.* $2^{25\text{-}9}$, $3^{27\text{-}31}$; Re the *Promise Rom.* $4^{4\text{-}16}$, $9^{22\text{-}33}$; Re *Messiah Eph.* $1^{9\text{-}11}$, $2^{13\text{-}18}$; Re *Chosen Race Eph.* $1^{18\text{-}23}$, $3^{4\text{-}6}$.

[7] Paul examines and exploits *sophia* (wisdom) in *1 Cor.* $1^{17\text{-}31}$, $2^{4\text{-}16}$; *Eph.* and *Col.* 8 times; appropriates *musterion* (secret) in *1 Cor.* 2^{7}, 4^{1}, 13^{2}, 15^{51}, *Eph.* and *Col.* 10 times; interprets *eleutheria* (liberty) in *1 Cor.* $9^{1, 19}$, 10^{29}, *Gal.* 2^{4}, $4^{26, 31\text{f}}$, 5^{13}; annexes *pleroma* (fullness) in *Eph.* 1^{23}, 3^{19}, 4^{13}, *Col.* 1^{19}, 2^{9}; corrects *pneumatikos* (spiritual) *1 Cor.* 2^{13}, 3^{1}, 12^{1}; and *gnosis* (knowledge) *1 Cor.* $8^{1, 11}$, 13^{21}, *2 Cor.* 4^{6}, 10^{5}, *Col.* 2^{3}, *1 Tim.* 6^{20}; and with a glance at the Roman standpoint adopts *autarchy* (self-sufficiency) *2 Cor.* 9^{8}, *Phil.* 4^{11}, *1 Tim.* 6^{6}, and *exousia* (authority) *Rom.* 9^{21}, $13^{1\text{-}3}$, *2 Cor.* 10^{8}, *Col.* 1^{13}, 2^{10}.

both Science and Religion, is calling for a similar synthesis of mutual understanding and exchange.

When we look at this achievement of the New Testament we recognize a canon of sound philosophy from which to start, namely, *the duality of man's approach to truth.* For the history of human thought is seamed in all directions with this dichotomy. Among the Scholastics Nominalism stood over against Realism, among the Theologians Calvinism over against Arminianism, among the Churchmen Protestantism against Catholicism, and, recently, Fundamentalism against Modernism[8]. Most relevant of all to the subject of this article is the gulf at present existing between Science with its interest in natural Process and Religion with its faith in spiritual Purpose.

We have indeed to accept the fact that Wisdom comes to us from both East and West, from Beneath and Above, and it is the function of Philosophy, as someone has said, to think things together. In this world of divided thought the mind is eager for a synthesis and a true philosophy will bestride the opposites like a Colossus.

There is a second canon of a sound philosophy in close alliance with the other. We must recognize not only the duality of thought but the principle of tension, from the atom with its balance of electrons to the universe with its mutual tug of centrifugal and centripetal[9]. Berkeley described a similar tension in human nature:

> Man is a compound of contrarieties, which breed a restless struggle in his nature, between flesh and spirit, the beast and the angel, ever weighed down and ever bearing up.

Bertrand Russell from a different point of view comes to a corresponding conclusion: "Human life is a perpetual interaction between volition and uncontrollable facts". H. G. Wells finds a similar tug of war in the intellectual field—"two main antagonistic trends in the mental life of the world to-day". "There not only is", writes Archbishop Temple, "but there ought to be, tension between philosophy and religion"[10].

Now a closer view reveals the fact that in actual life the principle of tension points to something higher than the forces that are

[8] So in psychology: "There are two worlds . . . the world of sense-experience and the world of reason" (C. E. M. Joad, *Return to Philosophy,* 124), or in Berkeley's graceful words, "Sense at first besets and overbears the mind . . . till intellect begins to dawn and cast a ray on this shadowy scene".

[9] In the language of A. N. Whitehead: "In the inescapable flux there is something that abides, in the overwhelming permanence something that escapes into flux" (quoted by Inge, *God and the Astronomers,* 116). This almost reproduces a key conception in the classic philosophy of China: "The universe is a dualism the two terms of which are Li and Ch'i—described by Chu Hsi as respectively the Pilot and the Plenum of the universe. Ch'i itself is a tension between two complementary modes, namely, Yang and Yi (energy and inertia)" (J. P. Bruce, *Chu Hsi and his Masters,* 100 and 149).

[10] Berkeley, *Philosophical Reflections,* 294; Russell, *Power,* 265; Wells, *The Fate of Homo Sapiens,* 289; *Nature, Man and God,* 55.

employed. Undoubtedly the balance between opposite powers in gravitation and electricity is the basis of the world's stability and peace, and in the same way the tension of forces in human nature is necessary for the achievement of character. Civilization, too, results from the successful balance between opposing points of view. So it is with all the works of man. Engineers have to balance stresses in order to secure power. And the cathedral illustrates the same secret in stone, namely, that tension is the basis of the noblest form of strength. In art also the music of stringed instruments, whether 'cello, harp, or piano, depends on tension between two rigid points. By all these illustrations we are guided to the conclusion that opposites that can hold their own must be treated with respect because a higher reality than either depends on what is contributed by both.

The paragraphs above are by no means a mere digression, for they have given us the key to the whole argument that follows. What is true concerning the tension of force is equally true of duality in thought and gives two assurances to philosophy: (1) that each side of the dualism is worthy of a hearing and valuable for its own contribution, and (2) that this very dualism argues for the unity of which they are part. Just as tension of force issues in a new reality so dualism of thought argues a higher truth. *It is not meant to leave us in agnosticism.*

The spiritual and scientific theories of life and the universe were certainly kept in stable balance during the two centuries from Isaac Newton to Charles Darwin. In fact from *The Advancement of Learning* to *The Descent of Man* our greater minds were at home with a twofold outlook[11]. It seemed as natural then as having two eyes to survey on the one hand the *created* forces of Nature and on the other *creative* Power. The former provided the field of Science, inviting the knowledge that is based on induction and experiment, while the character of the Creator was intuitively discerned in His "works", so "faint revealed yet sure divined", confirming the evidence of His spirit within—the aspirations, the conscience, the joy, the love, that animate mankind when at its best.

Why was this balance destroyed, this philosophy of life as a whole displaced by a litter of half-baked theories in the literature that preceded the two great wars? No doubt the dogmatic outworks of religious faith in the 19th century were soon proved to be untenable, but it is just as true that the assumptions of mechanical science with which they were attacked have long been superseded. And the reason why, in spite of this fact, science has gained ground from religion is probably this, that the former has

[11] Even the monistically-bent Spinoza contrasted *Natura naturans* and *Natura naturata.*

been far more ready to correct its hypotheses than the latter to purify its traditions. Thus personality has been belittled and God beclouded in contemporary thought by the drift of three considerations.

(i) First there was the enormous expansion of the scientific field during the last thirty years of the 19th century, made more explosive by the futile, though intelligible, resistance of those who considered themselves, and were generally considered, priests of the knowledge of the Above and Beyond. Such a floodlight was poured upon processes that purpose was thrown into a deep shadow that still persists. As Mr. H. G. Wells has written in another connexion, "So far from lighting the world the skies are so overcast that the starry constellations seem scarcely to be shining". It would be a friendly wind, however, that did not bring any loss. And it is a sure by-product of progress that as we advance to a new kind of knowledge we lose a measure of sensibility to what was in clear evidence before. Thus the Maoris of New Zealand, being members of an unscientific race, had a sense of direction in the heart of a forest where the Western immigrants, being used to a compass, were without it completely lost. Similarly the knowledge of the steps of Causation has disabled our apprehension of miracle, and process has been magnified at the expense of meaning. Investigators were led to assume that there was a material substance at the back of all phenomena, and if only they kept on digging they would come upon the material core of all reality[12]. In the course of the next generation science dug deep enough to find it disappear. ("The atom", says Eddington[13], "is as porous as the solar system".) But it held its own in popular opinion long after it was found to be a complete illusion. It was this *fallacy of substance* then that led the new philosophies to dispense with the invisible and immeasurable and the high realm of Purpose.

(ii) But there was a second reason for the abandonment of our two canons of a sound philosophy. The enthusiasm of discovering the processes that lie behind man's outfit of body and of mind encouraged many to suppose they could make one or other of these discoveries serve as the basis for a philosophy of human life.

It would clear away life's mystery by cutting out the elements that were beyond the range of science. It was in fact the *fallacy of simplification,* a fallacy soon found out, for various depart-

[12] "The thoughts to which I am now giving utterance and your thoughts regarding them", said T. H. Huxley at Edinburgh in 1868, "are the expression of molecular changes in the *matter* of life" (Susan Stebbing, *Philosophy and the Physicists,* 143). "It is hardly in keeping with the best traditions of Science that its representatives should play the parts of popular philosophers and pontiffs", is a relevant remark of Prof. Wolf in *Outlines of Modern Philosophy,* 592.

[13] *The Nature of the Physical World,* 1; *cf.* 225.

ments of science confidently offered the key in turn, and the mystery is now mingled with muddle.

"I have lived", writes Prof. Edman[14] of Columbia University,

> through many fashions in ideas — Dewey, Bergson, Freud, Marx, Einstein, T. S. Eliot, not to speak of Behaviourism, whose founder is now in the advertising business.

(iii) On the other hand it must be admitted that the conservative element in religion also has worked for a lop-sided philosophy[15]. Church leaders objected to the new discoveries because they fostered doubt concerning orthodoxy, not considering that many a prejudice of popular theology was derived from medieval times through assimilation of a pagan environment or by a literalistic reading of the Bible. Identifying these theories with the faith, they refused any hearing to scientific voices, and made terms with the *fallacy of superiority*—the supposition that because one's ideas are first in the field they should be considered final, and so, to quote Mr. Wells again, they "carried passive resistance to the pitch of know-nothingness"—a kind of inverted agnosticism.

Each of these three fallacies presents a text for further comment.

(i) As to the *"fallacy of substance"*. The bias in favour of what is visible or measurable is still represented by the fashionable assumption (it is hardly a profession now) of Agnosticism. T. H. Huxley gave it this name in the days before matter had been found to be the "great illusion", by way of retort to clerics who were over-confident in the strength of their dogmatic traditions. But in the name of progress it is more than time for the word, and the spirit which it represents, to be abolished, as the token of a vendetta unworthy of people who are not only called to the grace of unity but are crying out for it[16]. In any case, two wrongs do not make a right, neither do they make for sound science or wholesome religion. To maintain this Agnosticism is not the virtue of sincerity but the virus of fear on the part of the traditionalists, of fashion on the part of the rationalists. For the *mind* of man is as cloudy as the skies of England: to see things "in a dry light" is a rare achievement even for philosophers.

[14] *Philosopher's Holiday,* 246, 252. *Cf.* C. E. M. Joad in *Philosophy for our Times,* 9: "Each philosopher seeks to overthrow the conclusions which his predecessor has sought to establish". Walter Lippmann quotes the phrase of Aristophanes, "Whirl is King", and adds, "For want of a moral authority to turn to there is coercion in opinions, fashions and fads" (*A Preface to Morals,* 9).

[15] "The sceptical and the credulous in certain ways are much alike. It is as if they were living in an enclosed harbour and had forgotten the sea outside. One day there is an exceptional tide: one says it is impossible . . . the other that it is a stroke of magic" (Charles Morgan, *The Voyage,* 227).

[16] "The kind of explanation of natural happenings that seemed satisfactory to the Victorian physicist has been completely abandoned" (Susan Stebbing, *Philosophy and Physicists,* 266).

Thus Bertrand Russell detects equally in Hegelians, Pragmatists, and Bergsonians the will to power. It may even be surmised that "Agnosticism" itself *may* be influenced by the will to escape the implications of knowledge regarding a realm that evades the microscope indeed but assuredly invades the consciousness. Agnosticism is the twin of "Neutrality"—the progeny of an age that does not *mean* to be involved, and equally in the end they both work for the more material side of the issue before them[17].

Prof. Joad blames Science for the materialistic bias of the age[18]. But surely it is the function of Philosophy, not of Science, to provide the human outlook. Science is no more responsible because agnostic writers have hastened to make it the sole basis of their philosophy than it is responsible for the diabolic uses to which its inventions are sometimes put. The onus of allowing the normal perspective of human life to be distorted lies rather upon those teachers and writers who have hidden the key to knowledge with its two hemispheres by the unblessed evasion of Agnosticism. For consciousness of the Above-and-Beyond is as surely the complement to knowledge of the Beneath-and-Behind as Convex is to Concave.

(ii) In regard to the fallacy of *Simplification* one should perhaps give a cursory review of the successive theories that have crystallized out from scientific discoveries in various departments of our underworld—such as the prehistoric processes behind us, the racial tendencies at work within us, and the subconscious motives that we have (subconsciously) repressed. Putting all together, we have been given a picture of human life as the apparently blind output of the illimitable past, that has been provided by the conclusions of geology for the imaginative excursions of H. G. Wells and J. Harvey Robinson.

This general outline has been filled in by investigators of our bodily (biology) and mental (psychology) heritage, who have concluded that our self-consciousness is a victim of the subconscious or a refined variant of the physical. There has also been an analysis of Mind from the standpoint of environment, showing how it has been shaped by instincts of the herd. And all the while the physicists have been reducing the human embryo to the protoplasmic cell, and within the cell to the atom, and within the atom to the orbit of an electron. In fact what began in heredity finished

[17] In regard to the late civil war in Spain our Government was agnostic that it might be neutral, and the neutrality favoured the anti-democrats.

[18] "For the last 100 years the common man has taken it for granted that the scientific picture of reality is accurate" (*Philosophy for our Times*, 30).

in chemistry, what began with the microscope ended in mathematics[19].

Prof. Joad says[20]: "Common sense generally embodies the petrified science of 50 years ago—that only material things are real". I wonder! I rather believe common sense requires a balanced view between the Above and the Beneath, and that the common man is by no means at home with a mind marooned in science, and is frankly baffled by the loss of his "sky", his free-will, and his honest affections.

There is indeed no escape from the conclusions, whether physical or psychic, which emerge from experiment duly guided by hypothesis, corrected and co-ordinated by the faithful spirit of Science. They do not destroy, however, a religious philosophy of life, but only provide a report of the world of process which a religious philosophy should be ready to take into account. The trouble has been that the investigation as to how we came to be has unfortunately, through the lure of fallacious simplification, been taken as the basis for the piecemeal philosophies of Agnosticism which have held the stage in turn.

(a) In the materialistic phase of Science, for instance, Haeckel found in protoplasm his all-in-all. His monism was speciously simple until he was detected importing into every stage of development the very ideas he professed to be explaining.

(b) By way of reaction from the mechanism that held the field of thought till (say) 1910, the dynamic of the unconscious provided Henri Bergson with yet another clue. Instinct, he argued, uses intelligence for the blind adventure of life, and it is only in action that life finds reality. But faith in such vitality bears the fruit of destructiveness, and already *élan vital,* accepted as the justification for human policy, is heading for *calamité fatale.*

(c) In the languid days of reaction after the Four Years' War, litterateurs like D. H. Lawrence sensed as a philosophy worthy of human life one that rested completely on the physical side of human nature, "founded on the abdomen where the bloom stream surges". "Everything good has reference to the belly", wrote a disciple of Epicurus. But old Rome knew better than that, and the place of "pleasure" was defined by Seneca: *"Non dux sed comes voluptas"*—life's accompanist but not its conductor.

(d) Yet a fourth ground for a piecemeal philosophy in the name of simplification has been chosen by the founder of

[19] "*physicum terminatur in mathematico*", as Bacon put it (*Nov. Org.* ii. 8). According to Sir James Jeans, "The secret of nature has yielded to the mathematical line of attack. It has won a success such as is not shown by the æsthetic, poetic or moral pictures of the universe" (W. R. Inge, *God and the Astronomers,* 32).

[20] *Ibid.,* 31.

Behaviourism, who, finding in the trend of Science no place for Mind, offers the creed that all "mental processes" are reactions from environment. So the face is no longer a dial for personal expression, but a kind of death-mask!

(e) Finally Mr. Aldous Huxley until recently took *Life* for the key to his philosophy (Life in the sense of *Bios,* not of *Zoe,* which is the sense in which it is used by his brother Julian), and disseminated the doctrine that as Nature is so profuse human life should be as prodigal[21]. Sceptical of life's higher values, he yet scarifies those who miss them. Thus instead of thinking two standpoints together as a philosopher, he knocks their heads together as a satirist, exhibiting in his clever self the inconsistency of which he accuses the world.

These instances are enough perhaps to show that the variability and partiality of the Scientific basis on which these various forms of Agnosticism rely can only make their conclusions both uncertain and conflicting. And this is inevitable, for the analysis of our "underworld" is after all a laboratory view of human nature[22], an investigation so to speak of the twigs of a tree rather than the tree itself, and the result is a difficulty in seeing the tree for the twigs. Thus the truth has been hindered by the fallacy of simplification.

(iii) There is need of a third paragraph to comment on the remaining ailment in the thought and moral atmosphere of our time —the *fallacy of superiority,* the dangerous assumption that what is prior can afford to stand still as if it were final, the mandarin attitude of those who "seem to be pillars of the Church". In one of Disraeli's letters in 1849 he refers to a visit to the Duke of Wellington, who declared that his one certainty in politics was the necessity for resistance to change[23]. And so far as Religion is institutional and therefore legally minded it is also tempted to idolize the Past. Ecclesiastical pundits have been attempting to fortify their credal position by ever more reverential imitation of ancient use and ceremony. On account of this preoccupation they have been upsetting that balance between Word and Sacrament, Reason and Devotion, which is the practical (or pastoral) philosophy of the true Church. It is a serious sign of defeatism in the realm of spiritual truth to suggest that though the devil may not

[21] "The soul" (he wrote in *Brave New World*) "must assimilate the world through all the elements of sense and desire, thought and feeling, which Nature has provided for the purpose. . . . Once you begin to admit explanations in terms of purpose you lose faith in happiness as the sovereign good" (106, 209).

[22] "Physics then, on Prof. Eddington's view, deals with a closed world, the boundaries of which are quantitative and measurable" (Joad, *ibid.,* 132).

[23] *Letters to Lady Londonderry,* 143. Lord Macmillan in a book (1940) on *Law and Other Things* has a chapter on "Two ways of Thinking", in which he approves the words of a "wise statesman" (the Earl of Falkland), "What it is not necessary to change it is necessary not to change". Well, Law is one way of thinking, Religion has to take the other.

have the "monopoly of good tunes" he has the exclusive use of honest reason[24].

From this standpoint bridge-builders are accounted the troublers of Israel. Dr. Inge, with his "intellectual" insight and his journalistic pen, is, if not an *enfant terrible*, a *penseur dangereux*. The late B. H. Streeter's valiant alliance with men of scientific standing is pooh-poohed in cathedral circles, and Bishop Barnes's frank acceptance of science is treated with hostility or derision.

The performance of High Mass may indeed be fitted to the Gothic architecture of our cathedrals, but the evasion of scientific thought will contribute nothing to the mental architecture of the coming age. The cathedrals, by the way, will always preach to our admiring eyes the boldness of the Medieval Church in the adoption of new building ideas in the medium of stone: in the 13th and 14th centuries there was no harking back to the primitive. But among the modern architects of religious truths few are the real successors to the Apostles Paul and John.

The fallacy of superiority, however, is not confined to the hierarchical Churches. Of such a mould are many earnest readers of the Bible who, in small groups, or in the wake of some self-assured apostle, get on the track of obscure predictions or irrelevant texts, regarding scholarship with pity and science with contempt, and defending their pill-box of orthodoxy against the assault of wider truth as if it were indeed the citadel of Faith itself.

It is still supposed in many quarters that Darwin's theory of Man's bodily inheritance is a slur on the Creator and His work. But it is no degradation to learn that we are vitally related to every living thing and to inorganic substance too, that the stars for instance are

> Not frosty lamps illumining dead space,
> . . . . . .
> The fire is in them of which we are born,
> The music of their motion may be ours.

After all, the Bible has already given us, as it were in shorthand, the gist of our subconscious nature, has been frank about the "dust" from which we are derived, the "demons" that may possess us and perplex our friends, the "stiff neck" with which we walk in the "ways of our fathers", the "mind of the Flesh" which

[24] "We have too often been guilty of the sin against the eternal and creative Spirit, of that moral blindness which assigns His gifts of new truth to Beelzebub, and which in so doing proves us unforgiven and out of touch with Him" (C. E. Raven in *The Creator Spirit*, 95). *Cf.* the reflections of Canon Ronder in Hugh Walpole's *The Inquisitor*: "The problem of Christianity now is how to be intelligent enough to deal with modern Science, Higher Criticism and the rest. . . . Religion is faith but is also intelligence. They can, they must combine". "A too static trust in ancient history may reduce the Church to impotence", says *The Church Times* in an editorial, 20 Sept., 1940.

characterizes the "children of Wrath" (*i.e.*, people given to, or driven by, irrational passion), the "law of sin in our members", and so on. All such phrases describe in the language of two or three thousand years ago the bundle of passions, furtive or frustrated, which science has showed are at work within us. This is the "body of our humiliation", with the queer subconscious forces that we are to beware of, either to resist or transmute.

Finally we shall be done with the fallacy of the "superior" attitude if we recognize that the revelation through science is already improving not only the conditions of our daily life, reducing its toil, discomfort, and pain, but the spirit of our legislation too, helping us to fulfil the command to "love our neighbour as ourself". More than that, it enables us to understand the forces latent in human nature, welling up into consciousness from ancestral springs and racial fountains. Thus we may be led to broader and saner (and more Christ-like) judgments of our fellows, for it points to the conclusion that we should be (as R. L. Stevenson puts it) "more lenient to others, more severe with ourselves". No one would venture to say that this attitude was typical of the days when orthodoxy rode the high horse.

Thus the group of sciences regarding what is beneath and behind us, although quite inadequate as a base for philosophy, has brought us truth of serious value in the realm of ethics. It presents man with an account of the material he has to handle in the building of character and the fulfilment of personality, and should inspire a quicker sense of dependence on and responsibility to God. Moreover it brings home the possibility of sublimating the lower forces or harnessing the natural impulses to the service of beauty, truth, or love, which is a practical translation of *Rom.* 6 and the now trite, but once tremendous, words, "conversion, justification, and sanctification".

Father M. C. D'Arcy's *Death and Life* (Longmans, 5s.) is more stimulating than satisfying, but it certainly ought to be read. Noteworthy features are the use made of the mystics and the quotations which head the chapters. The more philosophical sections are good, but Father D'Arcy's dogmatism will alienate many readers: sentences like the following will irritate the seeker rather than convince him:

> We know for certain that a body can be very unlike all that we have experienced. The dogmas of the risen Body of Christ and the Eucharist are warrant for this.

About life after death we are told that "The Scriptures are too plain to admit of disagreement". If so, it is passing strange that believers in universalism, conditional immortality, and "as the tree falls so shall it lie" all claim support from the Bible. Strange as it may seem, we found ourselves most in sympathy with the chapter on "Purgatory". There is a misprint on p. 81.

RELIGIOUS LIFE IN CAMBRIDGE IN THE EIGHTIES OF LAST CENTURY

By H. N. Dixon, M.A., F.L.S.

The following recollections of religious life at Cambridge in the seventies and eighties of last century were suggested by the Editor's wish, prompted by Dr. Selbie's interesting article in the January *Quarterly*, for recollections of the theological conditions at Oxford in those early days. They are in no way an attempt to do for Cambridge what was suggested for Oxford; they have no pretence to deal with the theological atmosphere or with theological personalities; they are simply quite superficial recollections of the religious life at Cambridge during my residence there. The interest of reminiscences of this kind to the narrator is often in inverse ratio to that felt by the reader; but it is just possible that that interest may increase (for the reader) in direct proportion to the square of the distance (in time), and so justify these neo-Georgian recollections of Victorian events and personalities.

I was at school at Cambridge for some years before entering the University, and my recollections go back (dimly) into the seventies. We attended the Baptist Chapel in St. Andrew's Street, and I recall hearing Thomas Cooper the Chartist preach there. I have a dim impression of his fine, strong presence, that is all, but his name meant something in those days. I recall, too, old Mr. Clear, one of the stalwart pillars of the church, and his sons. He made an impression on me, partly because of his habit of standing up during the prayers; he must have been one of the last to maintain that time-honoured practice.

During my schoolboy days Emmanuel Chapel was opened (it is probably called Emmanuel Church now—chapel would be too humble a name for a building within a stone's throw of King's College Chapel!), and as my uncle, Dr. Henry Allon, was to preach the opening sermon, my brother and I had perforce the somewhat doubtful privilege of attendance. All my recollection is that the sermon was well over an hour, I believe an hour and a half, long, and of hearing another uncle saying that he had not thought it a long sermon, to be met with the rejoinder, "Why, Charles, you were asleep half the time".

When at Cambridge I frequently heard the University sermon at Great St. Mary's. I once heard Bishop Magee, but I forget the sermon entirely. I also heard Phillips Brooks, on Tolerance—I do

recall the opening part of that sermon. Further preachers I heard were Canon Farrar, and several bishops, who seem to have failed to make a deep impression.

Other preachers, mainly at Emmanuel, were Baldwin Brown, George Macdonald, John Stoughton, R. W. Dale, Joshua Harrison, and Guinness Rogers. Dale's sermon was on a text from *Ecclesiastes,* and he began by saying that the writer of the book was generally considered to be a very good man, but he considered him to be a very bad one!

There was no Presbyterian place of worship in Cambridge then, but some of the leading Presbyterian ministers of the day preached from time to time on Sundays at the Corn Exchange. I remember some of these distinctly, particularly "Robertson of Irvine"; I can well recall a few of the passages in his brilliantly dramatic manner. One was a vivid narration of the different reasons (*apropos* of Dives and Lazarus) why the five brothers of Dives would refuse to receive his message and warning. I can see him now, his slight figure, his handkerchief held delicately to his nose, as he pictured one of the brethren, a fop, complaining that it was very offensive for a dead man to come among their company!

Moody and Sankey paid one of their visits to Cambridge when I was up; I attended some of the meetings, and found certainly nothing repelling, if not to me markedly compelling, in them. The undergraduate is at a very impressionable age, and the Mission had certainly a deep and probably a lasting effect on many. This too was at the time of Lavington and Walford Hart, and of the Studd brothers—but I must not allow myself to be led astray to Fenners.

The one religious movement with which I was at all closely associated at Cambridge was the Cambridge University Society for the Promotion of Religious Equality, an undenominational union of University men, the main purpose of which was to break down, or rather to ignore, denominational barriers, and make protest against ecclesiastical privilege. The platform was educational, not polemical, though no doubt it was viewed askance by some of the well-entrenched Anglican dignitaries, like Perowne of Corpus. "The Position of Theology in the Universities" was the subject of one of the papers, but it dealt more with the administrative system than with theology. Among the leading founders of the Society were Courtney S. Kenny, Fellow of Downing and Reader in Law; my uncle, Neville Goodman, and Rendel Harris. Norman Hardcastle of Downing was the Secretary, and I was Assistant Secretary; we divided the functions between us; I did the donkey work and he got the *kudos*. Let us hope the old proverb was well

parted between us, and that I had the grace of God (I needed it), and he had enough! Others in the leadership were Welldon, afterwards Bishop of Calcutta, and Alfred Tillyard. We met at the rooms of various members, mostly Fellows, as the ordinary undergraduate's rooms were hardly adequate. I do not remember the number of members, but I find a note in a diary that I addressed 250 of the circulars one afternoon (the rest next day), so the membership was not altogether insignificant. Among the speakers from outside I recall Moncure D. Conway, of South Place, London, and R. F. Horton, around whom just then Oxford was beginning to seethe.

A rather memorable meeting took place, I think in 1881, when Arnold Toynbee and Canon Fremantle, of the Oxford Church Reform Union, came and spoke on Church Reform. Toynbee spoke on the ideals of Church life, the Canon followed with detailed reforms in worship, *etc.*, which they proposed. Arnold Toynbee took us up into very high realms, while it was felt that Canon Fremantle let us down again, with a very heavy bump, to earth; the proposals seemed so petty and pedestrian after the noble ideals and aspirations held up to us by Toynbee. I think, but am not sure, that the idea of founding University Settlements in East London was ventilated at this meeting; certain it is that that movement could not have given a more well deserved honour to a noble spirit than by the dedication of "Toynbee Hall".

This meeting was held in the rooms of Oscar Browning, at King's. O.B., as he was generally known, had a beautiful set of rooms, lined from ceiling to floor with a magnificent library of many thousands of volumes. He used to tell how "Johnny Perkins", Tutor and Fellow of Downing, rather of the type of the old fox-hunting parson (whose qualifications for the Tutorship, whatever they were, hardly included erudition), was once in his rooms, and O.B. asked—pathetically, one supposes—referring to his books, what he was to do with them. "Why, read 'em, read 'em", said Perkins.

O.B. was one of the notable characters of the University at that time. He was a relative of the poet, though it was commonly held that in O.B.'s valuation Robert Browning was a relative of *his*. Rotund, bald-headed, with an adequate sense of his own dignity, his was a well known figure, not only in the streets of Cambridge, but, it would seem, in the Courts of the world. "Quite the nicest Emperor I have known", he is reputed to have said of Franz Josef (he is not the only one to whom this has been attributed, but I think he was certainly the original). His tendency to corpulence made him the theme of one of the best epigrams I know, from the pen, I think, of J. K. Stephen:

O.B., O be obedient
To Nature's stern decree,
Lest you should be not one, O.B.,
But too obese, O.B.

Meetings of the "Liberation Society" held in the town at that time provoked some feeling. My uncle, Neville Goodman, had a good deal to do with them. Before I went up to the University, when he was an undergraduate at Peterhouse, he was announced as to take part in one of these meetings. Perowne, then Master of Corpus, and I believe Vice-Chancellor (a very different man in outlook and spirit from his brother, afterwards Bishop of Worcester), summoned my uncle to his presence, though he had no jurisdiction over him in this matter. After some conversation Perowne pompously began, "Mr. Goodman, I warn you, as a member of this university—" "Excuse me", interrupted my uncle, who was then only in the undergraduate stage, "I am not a member of the University". "Er, Er, I, as a member of this University, warn you. . . . " I do not think the warning had any effect.

Other Masters of Colleges were not always *personæ gratæ* in those days, though many of them were fine men and highly popular. It was said that a pompous Master of Trinity about that time announced at a meeting that he had been offered a bishopric. "I declined", he said, "there are many bishops, but there is only one Master of Trinity". "Thank God for that", piped up a small voice at the back of the Hall.

Another meeting which I attended provoked a good deal of feeling. It was held in the Guildhall in protest against the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill (the Bill to legalize such marriages). The platform was as reactionary a Tory-Ecclesiastical cohort as could well be got together, the then Bishop of Ely, Earl Beauchamp, Beresford Hope, the Master of Selwyn, *etc.* Hot and more or less slanderous speeches were made, no opportunity for discussion was given, no resolution was moved, though the meeting was continually challenged to bring forward arguments in favour of the Bill! The audience finally broke up the meeting in disgust.

I am aghast to find, on looking up an old diary, that on May 11th, 1880, I took a Divinity paper in an Exam. I certainly have no recollection of doing any such thing, but *litera scripta manet!* It was an examination for a scholarship, which I did not get. But I begin to think I have better qualifications as a writer for the *Congregational Quarterly* than I had dreamed! That same day I attended lectures, solved a whist problem for the *Cambridge Review*, played tennis and whist, wrote some letters, and worked for two hours. A full day!

William Noble, the founder of the Blue Ribbon Army, was an occasional visitor to Cambridge on his campaign — a delightful man, and a great temperance advocate. He usually stayed at my uncle's (Neville Goodman). He was always accompanied by his concertina; indeed William Noble without his concertina would have been almost as inconceivable as Moody without Sankey. My uncle was an indefatigable lawn tennis player, and I frequently played there when Noble was his visitor. While we played, Noble would wander about the lawn, playing his concertina, strolling across the court, and not infrequently getting hit by a ball. Perfectly unconscious that he was spoiling the game, "Don't mind me, don't mind me", he would say, imposing a heavy strain on my uncle's courtesy, which was only equalled by his sense of the seriousness of lawn tennis.

One of the men of the same year as I at Christ's was E. A. Wallis Budge, even then a noted Oriental scholar. It was said of him—as was often said of others, but in his case perhaps with more truth—that he knew more than his examiners in the Semitic Languages Tripos. However this may have been, it was in accord with his later brilliant and often adventurous achievements in Egypt and the British Museum. I was reading Sanskrit at the time, and I remember pleasing him with a suggestion that the "horses of the night" of the Vedas might have been the origin of our word "nightmare".

F. W. H. Myers was living at Cambridge then, but I never met him, though I have been interested in Psychical Research, and have been a Member of the Society almost from the beginning. The Sidgwicks too, founders of the Society with Myers, he the eminent Professor of Moral Philosophy, she at the time Vice-Principal of Newnham College—then a fledgling—and afterwards Principal for many years, playing a great part in the firm establishment of women in university life at Cambridge. It has been a source of surprise to many that Cambridge, with its generally more liberal and progressive outlook, has persistently refused degrees to women while Oxford has granted them. I suggest that Cambridge, fearing the distraction from domestic duties that such a prize might entail, determined that if Oxford were the home of lost causes, Cambridge should not be the cause of lost homes!

Yes, as one looks back at university life at Cambridge in those days, glowing with many colours, sparkling from many facets, one feels that its religious life was not the least of these, when men like Westcott, Lightfoot, Hort, Creighton, Robertson Smith, Seeley, Rendel Harris, and Forsyth were walking its streets and lecturing in its Halls.

A CENTURY OF CHAPEL ARCHITECTURE 1840—1940

By Dr. Andrew L. Drummond

An eminent German architect, surveying modern English Church Architecture at the beginning of the 20th century, allotted more than a third of his volume[1] to the Free Churches. As an intelligent foreigner, he was appreciative of the freedom of Nonconformity and its progressive achievements, exemplified by up-to-date Sunday School buildings. But he was apparently blind both to the sheer tastelessness of Victorian chapels and the quiet dignity of 18th century meeting houses. He mentions the village sanctuary at Walpole, Suffolk (1647), one of the few pre-Restoration Dissenting buildings, referring us carefully to the *Congregational Year Book* for 1868, p. 401: but he ignores altogether the dignified meeting houses that were erected after 1688 and during the early 18th century. Plate XXXII is, however, significant in revealing the appalling degeneration of the type of church planned mainly for preaching. The first Whitefield's Tabernacle (1756) was a substantial and not unattractive building with the roof rising into a quaint turret. The second Whitefield's was a graceful pillared temple of the early 19th century, flanked by small towers crowned by cupolas. The third Whitefield's is a gimcrack chapel of 1900. Miss Muriel Harris ("Eutychus") remarked in *Truth* that it looks as though it had come out of a box of those German stone bricks which were supposed to give infants an architectural sense:

> Black pillars with curly heads, Byzantine arches, glass suggestive of a mid-Victorian railway restaurant, galleries culminating at the east end in terraces of shiny wood, browbeaten by an organ . . . pens of pitch-pine below.

This dreary specimen of a preaching-place was typical of Nonconformist chapels all over England. Maximum seating at minimum cost, with abundant cheap ornamentation, was in demand. Nonconformity attained its greatest popularity in the Victorian period, but chapel-builders usually erred in providing a superfluity of "sittings"; and they went out of their way in trying to combine a rectangular or cruciform plan with the semi-circular pewing of the contemporary American "auditorium" (fortunately they did not often borrow the "Akron plan", whereby a system of ungainly partitions could be operated so as to throw the church and the Sunday School hall into one). It is not surprising that

[1] Hermann Muthesius, *Die Neuere kirchliche Baukunst in England.* Berlin. 1901. Fully illustrated with drawings and plans.

most English architects considered chapels as beneath their notice. Fritsch, the author of the standard history[2] of Protestant Church Architecture, issued under the auspices of the Union of Berlin Architects, discussed English and American Nonconformist Architecture in conjunction, giving fully as much attention to it as to Anglican ecclesiology. The Free Churches today comprise at least a third of the church-going population of England, so it ought not to be a matter of public indifference that their sanctuaries be designed to fit their function gracefully as well as usefully. A brief sketch of their evolution from the Victorian period will therefore be of some interest.

The Unitarians were the first to give up the awkward problem of trying to accommodate Gothic architecture to an auditorium plan. Mill Hill Chapel, Leeds (1848), appears to have been the first Nonconformist church to build a regular chancel. About 1850 creditable Gothic chapels appeared at Banbury and Gee Cross, Cheshire, while chancels were added to 18th century meeting houses (*e.g.*, Warwick, 1863). These are reminiscent of Anglican churches in Evangelical hands; ecclesiology was cautiously admitted, though Unitarian theology ran to the opposite extreme from that of the Oxford Movement[3]. The Congregationalists, like the Unitarians, gradually adopted the chancel plan, but for many years only a few of their churches did so. A landmark in this respect is Christ Church, Westminster Bridge Road, London. When Rowland Hill's famous Surrey Chapel was demolished, his successor, Dr. Newman Hall, decided to build, with American aid, a really worthy church. Over £60,000 was collected under Hall's energetic leadership (see his *Autobiography*). In 1872 Paull & Bickerdyke produced a handsome Early English church with a lofty spire and suite of halls and schools, well integrated so as to form an effective group—an outstanding achievement that anticipated the co-relation of buildings for worship, religious education, and social fellowship. The interior has been criticized for its superfoliated capitals, Purbeck marble, Victorian furnishings and "stained glass with the quality of a transfer". But as far as the planning is concerned, the task of seating 2,000 people in a Gothic church was achieved with considerable success. The ground-plan formed a square, but the galleries stood well back from the eight stone pillars which supported the central lantern, on the analogy of Ely Cathedral. An elaborate pulpit with canopy stands at one of the pillars; the apse contains the Communion table, while the choir is seated in the chapel off the apse corresponding to the organ chamber on the opposite side.

[2] K. E. O. Fritsch, *Der Kirchenbau des Protestantismus, von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart.* Berlin. 1893.

[3] F. J. Jobson's *Chapel and School Architecture, as appropriate to the Buildings of Nonconformists,* was entirely based on Pugin's principles.

Some large Congregational Churches were built in fairly good Revival Gothic in the 80's and 90's — Richmond Hill, Bournemouth, by Lawson and Donkin (1889); Albion Church, Ashton-under-Lyne, by J. Brooks (costing £50,000); Trinity Church, Leeds, by Danby & Simpson (with excellent halls and tower, 1900). The last two buildings are emphatically Perpendicular, with deep chancels. St. James's, Newcastle, by Banks (1883), is a quite effective Early English exterior, with a Greek Cross plan and a spire at the crossing: internally, it is an awkward auditorium plan, with the side pews set at an angle to face the central pulpit. It should be compared with the Baptist Church of the Redeemer, Birmingham (1882). Hamstead Road Church, Birmingham (1883) is conventionally Early English, with pews in the aisles and an apse; it is one of the few Baptist churches where the Communion table takes the form of an altar[4]. Beechen Grove Baptist Church, Watford, dates from the same period but is an unusual Romanesque building with a lofty campanile, passage-like aisles, a large rear gallery and an apse for the Communion table and choir. Bromley Congregational Church, by Sulman (1882), is Early English—an immensely strong brick structure, not irreparably damaged by the German bombers in April, 1941; it had a well-designed central pulpit of stone and marble.

The Unitarians continued to build good Gothic Revival churches during the last quarter of the 19th century. Several of these were built by wealthy manufacturers, *e.g.*, Flowery Field, Hyde (1878), erected by Thomas Ashton of Hyde and designed by Thomas Worthington. Monton and Todmorden have both good spires. At Birmingham there is a great artistic advance from The Church of the Messiah (1861) to "Old Meeting" (1885), a genuine cruciform church with a stone interior, an admirable essay in the adaptation of medieval forms to the needs of modern congregational worship. If the furnishings in Old Meeting Church are not quite up to the excellence of design, the high-water mark of interior craftsmanship among Unitarian churches is reached at Ullet Road, Liverpool; here the chancel arrangement is seen at its best and the Communion table is not thrown into the shadow by stained glass, since windows filled with clear glass are screened from the congregation by the projecting piers of the further chancel arch.

At Mansfield College, Oxford, Basil Champneys designed a chapel in 14th Century Gothic (1889); its spacious and dignified interior could be improved by better furnishings and the removal

[4] It is only recently that Baptists seem to have realized the possibilities of the Baptistry in the symbolism of the chancel. The Coats Memorial Church, Paisley (1893), showed what could be done in this connexion. The Baptist Church at Rome is a simple but chaste building that clearly expresses the central themes of the Gospel. The open baptistry faces the congregation in the apse, with the Lord's table in front.

of the raised *sedilia* behind the Communion table, where the professors are enthroned as Olympians, facing the congregation. The late Principal Fairbairn superintended the scheme of symbolism for the stained glass windows and statues[5]. The result was a procession from the Apostles to R. W. Dale, including Origen and Athanasius, Abelard and Aquinas, Hooker and Melanchthon, Roger Williams and Cotton Mather, Vinet and Schleiermacher. "The most Catholic place in Oxford"—remarked that oecumenically-minded Continental divine, Friedrich Heiler.

Most of the students trained at Mansfield were destined to preach in chapels that violated every canon of good taste without always satisfying even utilitarian standards. Crammed with pews divided by narrow complicated passages, the ground floor often sloped towards the pulpit. The builders of these auditoriums pointed their windows, and darkened them with cheap coloured glass; they arched their ceilings so that even good acoustics, the *raison d'être* of the meeting house, was apt to fail. An enormous pitch-pine rostrum replaced the pulpit, with a choir-loft behind, backed by a phalanx of gilded organ-pipes, which gave the impression of being the main object of worship. Methodist chapels were, if anything, worse than those of the Baptist and Congregational order. They were apt to add the ugliest "ecclesiastical furnisher's" wares of the Anglican school—machine-made altar rails and choir stalls. Holly Park Wesleyan church, by Hool (1881), was representative of a type that tried to blend the chancel with the auditorium plan. Over a hundred Wesleyan churches, mostly in the South, retained a good deal of the Prayer Book, and their buildings are reminiscent of an Anglican Low Church.

Nonconformist difficulties were not solved, however, by avoiding Gothic and selecting a simple Romanesque or a classical style. Westminster Chapel, with its roof in loops (reminiscent of a huge pavilion) has been described as "a mixture of Prince Consort Norman and the tents of Israel". It was built in the early 'sixties, but when the King's Weigh House was erected in the West End a quarter of a century later, neither the passage of time nor the

[5] R. W. Dale also had a hand in this. (See A. W. W. Dale, *Life of R. W. Dale*, p. 503 and the following page, for his opinion about the Chapel):

> I was dismayed when Albert Spicer told me that it was proposed to put the pulpit at the corner of the platform. I always understood that we were to have a desk in the middle at the front, and that for the Communion service it would be pushed aside. For us to have a pulpit so placed as to leave the "altar" visible to the congregation is nothing less than a scandal; and to put the preacher to speak cross-wise for the sake of this is not only to dishonour the function of preaching but to impair its efficiency.

And a few days later:

> If it is quite certain that the voice cannot be heard except from the corner, *cadit quaestio;* but it is a miserable humiliation that we have not been able to build a little place like that fit for its main purpose. I wonder what would be said of the architect and building committee, if after they had erected a concert hall, a fiddler could be heard only when he stood in a corner. EDITOR.

choice of a famous architect (Arthur Waterhouse) produced the improvement that could be reasonably expected. Dr. Orchard thought[6] that the King's Weigh House

> would look like an oval-shaped boilerette, were it not masked by a façade, reminiscent of Lombardic and Norman styles; while there is an erection at the side which is neither a tower nor a steeple but a combination of both, and is even then borrowed from one of the Natural History Museum turrets. The curious design of this building, like that of so many Nonconformist structures, is due to the confused aim of trying to make an auditorium look like a traditional church.

Dr. John Hunter, Dr. Orchard's predecessor, entrusted to Sir John Burnet the task of forming a chancel by screening off the east end of the ellipse and dividing the organ (1903). This scheme was carried through with such skill and distinction that it completely harmonized with the galleried interior instead of appearing incongruous. For the last twenty years of the 19th century Dr. Hunter had been calling for "a renascence of worship", and his *Devotional Services* had gone into several editions. In many quarters there was a ready response and more worshipful churches came into being. One would expect Hampstead to respond, but it failed to, though Waterhouse was the architect and the minister of the new Congregational church was R. F. Horton, who had distinguished himself at Oxford. This Lyndhurst Road church (1895) with its hexagonal body and unexpected wings, somehow symbolized Dr. Horton's anti-clerical views. But its round arches, striped brick, gables and turrets merely reflected the passing fashions of the neighbouring villas.

James Cubitt was one of the few architects who realized that auditorium planning need not be inconsistent with good architecture. His *Church Design* (1870) and *Nonconformist Church Buildings* (1892) reveal a keen mind labouring to create a type of sanctuary that fulfilled its purpose gracefully. The "multi-cellular" medieval type with its obstructive pillars was his Scylla: the galleried preaching-house with its cast-iron posts was his Charybdis. A side pulpit, if skilfully placed, could actually facilitate good acoustics, as the preacher would not run the same risk of echo in facing a corner rather than a flat wall; and it would remove the objections to a central passage—so desirable for weddings, etc. In 1876 Mr. Cubitt designed Union Chapel, Islington; he had £25,000 to spend, but had to provide 1,650 sittings. An auditorium plan seemed inevitable, but a solution was boldly attempted in Early English. The ground-plan was roughly square, but the central part of the area, with its stone pillars and pointed arches, formed a spacious octagon. The galleries were skilfully tucked in by

[6] *From Faith to Faith*, p. 116.

treating them like medieval triforium galleries. The high pointed roof was too elaborately decorated internally (according to 20th century taste), but the whole building provides an effective centre for congregational worship. Along with the halls and massive tower (added in 1887) it forms an impressive *Gruppenbau* and deserves the praise accorded by Muthesius in his survey of modern Church Architecture. Mr. Cubitt demonstrated another of his schemes in a Welsh Presbyterian Church erected in London (1888). Here the Greek Cross plan allows "recess galleries" in the transepts and west end; Norman is quite happily adapted to the end in view and a polygonal tower over the crossing raises the chapel above the undistinguished level of the street. The Greek Cross plan has been used in the Congregational Church at Fairhaven, near St. Annes-on-Sea; but in this case Byzantine has been used, with rather a bizarre effect. It gleams strangely white in the sunshine, too reminiscent perhaps of swimming baths "in the oriental style"; internally it is a background for a striking series of stained glass windows representing great Reformers, Evangelicals, and Missionaries—the work of Luke S. Walmsley.

Considering the effectiveness of the classical style applied to 18th century meeting houses, like Ipswich (Friars Street) and Norwich (Octagon Chapel), one might suppose that this type could have developed so as to meet modern conditions, with variations suggested by the London City Churches—Cubitt wrote a pamphlet on *Wren's Work and its Lessons* (1884). But the Victorian chapel affected a degenerate classicism when it did not indulge in monstrous Gothic and bastard Romanesque. Spurgeon blessed Greek architecture—since the New Testament was written in Greek and Gothic had nothing to do with the New Testament. He got William Pococke to design a façade with six Corinthian pillars which were described as "handsome" in 1860. But the pillars that supported the Metropolitan Tabernacle's two tiers of balconies were cast-iron, and its interior, far from being Hellenic, suggested rather the standards of the Great Exhibition of 1851.

The City Temple was built a quarter of a century later than the Tabernacle. It stood for Evangelical principles, intense political Nonconformity, civic pride, and newly acquired wealth. St. Andrew's, Holborn, might have suggested urbanity and Wren's churches generally might have suggested good taste. But £70,000 (an immense sum in 1874) and "the Great White Pulpit" (presented by the City) could not command Beauty. "The Temple is very like a City Hall in oleograph", says "Eutychus" in *Truth*:

> It has gilding, moulding, Egypto-Corinthianissimo pillars; it is full of stained glass of an ultra Holman Huntishness; full of dark tones, which somehow are not deep (green and choco-

late being favoured tones); bursting with organ, drapery and marble pulpit.

Towards the end of the 19th century English Baroque effloresced in Union Congregational Church, Brighton, where the Rev. R. J. Campbell ministered before going to the City Temple. Muthesius considers this pre-eminent among the chapels of the *Sekten;* he does not notice its resemblance to Berlin Cathedral, built about the same time. One connects Baroque with Lutheranism and thinks of the great domed *Frauenkirche* in Dresden—a kind of religious opera house. But the Baroque spirit is utterly discordant with the traditions of English Nonconformity, even though the exterior has niches filled with statues of Cromwell and Knox! Union Church was designed by J. W. Simpson at a cost of £75,000. It is surrounded by a great assemblage of guild rooms and class rooms, but these are well integrated into the external structure by a massive wall of rusticated masonry with cupola'd towers at each end. The central dome, which rises high above the peripheral extensions, boldly dominates the composition. It is a striking illustration of Geoffrey Scott's dictum that "Baroque intellectualized the picturesque". The façade, represented in Plate 30 of Muthesius's book on modern English church architecture, is impressive as well as picturesque. The interior, consisting of the dome and three apsidal recesses with balconies, is secular in its effect, though the walls are solid stone and the usual gilded plaster of Baroque is not in evidence. The fact that 2,000 people can be seated in chairs and not pews adds to the impression of the auditorium being a gigantic concert hall. The solemnity of a place of worship is lacking. The fact is, Baroque demands the sensuous glitter of Catholic ritual if it is to be used for Christian worship. Otherwise, it tends to be a secular art.

An obvious illustration is the Westminster Central Hall, built before the 1914 War, primarily for popular Wesleyan services. Wide doors and staircases, spacious vestibules and good lighting, all struck a cheerful note. *The Architectural Review* hailed it as "a great achievement", but pointed out that the dominant motifs failed to symbolize either Methodism or any other brand of Christian faith. In vain did the Central Hall boil up into cupolas and porticoes, and bubble with bronze and garlands. The spirit of worship was wanting, though it had found its way into the austerity of the old Puritan meeting houses. The same criticism of Baroque applies to some of the smaller churches, *e.g.*, the Primitive Methodist chapel in the Old Kent Road, designed by Banister Fletcher and B. F. Fletcher. Here is a dignified but lively façade designed by men steeped in the History of Architecture. It is admirable as a façade and breaks cheerfully into an East End street. But it

suggests an Edwardian Carnegie Library rather than a centre of Primitive Methodist worship (Muthesius, *ibid.*, fig. 131).

* * *

The 20th century witnessed an upward trend in the quality of Gothic. a revulsion from machine-made ornament and restless decoration, a new appreciation of "breadth" and simplicity. The Free Churches shared to a certain extent in this renascence. We may notice Penge Congregational Church in Beckenham Road, S.E.20 (1907), rather fortress-like with its dominating tower over the chancel and its narrow lights—doubtless symbolic of "the Church Militant". At Four Oaks, Birmingham, a fine Wesleyan church and schools, forming an attractive group in a suburban district, was designed by Messrs. Crouch, Butler, and Savage at the moderate cost of £11,000[7]. Mr. Joseph Crouch is the author of *Puritanism and Art,* which is helpful in dispelling traditional misunderstandings, and the joint author of a sound manual on *Churches, Mission Halls and Schools for Nonconformists* (Buckler & Webb, 1901).

The War of 1914-18 greatly increased the cost of building and practically ruled out the "stone interior" expected of a genuine Gothic church. There was an outburst of fresh and creative Gothic in the United States, but Britain could no longer afford it. One notable post-war church should be noted—Psalter Lane, known as "Sheffield's Methodist Cathedral", set in a six-acre garden:

> Internally, not a spot of paint or varnish can be found; wood and stone are all in natural colours. The beautiful altar cloth has been handwoven, and has a cream pattern on a blue ground. Italians were employed on mosaic work that could never be replaced if by accident any section got broken.

The cost was about £30,000. One of the better Methodist churches in new housing areas is Park Avenue, Northampton, which cost £22,000. The style is free Gothic. The central pulpit is retained and the prominent position of the organ and choir might be severely criticized, but the tracery of the windows, the mouldings, and the decoration generally are effectively co-related; there is evidence throughout of a designing mind that loves reverence, order and symmetry. At Bognor Regis there is a new Congregational church with a chancel, which shows what a resourceful architect can do in Gothic even under modern limitations. Unfortunately, Gothic of a late-Victorian type (machine-made brick, ornate tracery, crude coloured glass and "church furnisher's" fittings) continued to be built in some quarters between 1919 and 1939. This cheap "Nonconformist Gothic" still survives.

7 Illustrated in Nicholson and Spooner's *Recent Engl. Eccles. Architecture* (pp. 177-81. 1912). The same volume shows how artistic a central pulpit *can* be (Congreg. Ch., Palatine Road, Manchester, destroyed by fire, 1914).

Building costs have popularized a "diluted Gothic"—of which Enfield Wesleyan Church (1919) by Boreham & Gladding, and Sudbury Methodist Church, Middlesex, by George Baines & Son, are examples. Woodford Avenue, Ilford, is representative of the new type of Extension church promoted by the London Congregational Union. The prevailing oak, the leaded windows and the diffused lighting combine to make this a cheerful place of worship. But the architectural effect might have been much more satisfactory had Gothic not been chosen. The cost was about £20,000, but the nave is far too broad to be without aisles and the roof is too low-pitched. I doubt whether "near-Gothic" is an adequate substitute for the real thing: the need for economy may force us to search for some other article.

Radical modernist architecture, which was so widespread on the Continent between 1919 and 1939, is not likely to commend itself to many communities in Great Britain; they may use it for their shops, offices, and factories to an increasing extent, but are not prepared for "machines to worship in". Tradition is far too strong a force for that—and instinctively seeks continuity with the past. Messrs. Welch, Cachemaille-Day, & Lander, architects of that frankly modernistic building, St. Saviour's, Eltham, have produced an original Baptist church at Sutton, Surrey. The ceiling is nearly flat, but the brick arches are so pointed as to appear almost an exaggeration of Gothic; on the other hand it might be claimed that here is the Gothic spirit taking shape in modern materials and methods. The chancel is strikingly "vaulted"; the use of bright colour contrasts pleasantly with the white walls; and the side pulpit is so roomy as to defeat the usual objections made on practical grounds to that position. Churches in the modern style by Smee & Houchin at New Malden (Methodist) and Wembley Park (Congregationalist) convey a Gothic note of aspiration by pointed plaster ceilings. Mr. Rogers Houchin has also designed a Congregational church and halls at Swindon (Victoria Street) that, without a tower and with an absolute minimum of ornament, achieves distinction by its impression of height and spaciousness. The same quality is characteristic of Congregational interiors at Tolworth, Sanderstead, and Leatherhead; the last, by Percy W. Meredith, shows how a rich curtain can furnish a restful background for a simple Communion table. Union Church, Mill Hill, was begun in 1920 in a quiet country road and completed in 1935 after this had become a busy by-pass. Messrs. Walker & Harwood dealt resourcefully with the problem of traffic-noise, and broke away from the traditional Gothic of the earlier windows without destroying worshipful effect. It is an inexpensive church (£6,625) making full use of modern technique and placing the choir at the front of the nave rather than in the chancel.

It is worth noting that some of the less expensive modern churches have been among the most beautiful. "The Church of the Peace of God" at Oxted, Surrey, is in the form of a Greek cross with a low central tower. It was designed by Mr. Frederic Lawrence to seat 400 people at a cost of about £5,000. The interior walls are plastered with a slightly rough surface and are distempered in two shades, ivory-white and stone. The framework of the roof is of steel, cased in with wood. The rafters are finished in their upper surface with acoustic boarding. The artificial lighting is by hidden lamps. The Communion table, pulpit, and reading desk are of oak stained to a warm sepia, and have arabesques of gold and colour. The three chancel windows are filled with stained glass. There is a delightful lily-pond and fountain, also found at Mr. Lawrence's other attractive Congregational church at Southbourne, near Bournemouth (which has in addition a statue of St. Francis). The Southbourne interior is unlike any I have seen, the well-lighted chancel being entered by openings resembling a Palladian window. Mr. Lawrence is more successful in assimilating elements from Romanesque and Byzantine than most of his contemporaries. But other architects are experimenting in the use of the simple, round-headed arch. Elmwood Avenue Congregational Church, Warrington, and Northwood Presbyterian Church, Middlesex, are inspired by the austere basilica of the 4th and 5th centuries—the latter particularly, with its apse. But this type is apt to be hard and ungracious for want of mosaics. Sparkhill Congregational Church, Birmingham, blends attractive brickwork and plaster with a pleasant apse, and the high façade with its open arcade is original. At Hall Green, Birmingham, Mr. Joseph Crouch has designed a Romanesque Wesleyan Church with apse, which is an excellent example of the principles he advocates in his *Planning and Designing of a Methodist Church* (Birmingham, 1930). At Lenton Abbey, Notts, Byzantine has inspired a Congregational church; the interior, however, is more confused than one would expect, judging from the concentrated impression of the exterior, pointing to the *Zentralkirche* ideal.

There has been a tendency for "institutional churches" to abandon garish Baroque for a more serious style. It is refreshing to turn from Union Street Methodist Chapel, Torquay (which suggests a music hall), to the new Central Hall at Apsley, Notts, simple and massive, with the chancel furniture so arranged that nothing in the *mise-en-scène* on Sunday suggests Saturday night's concert. It should be possible to capture the note of Christian idealism, while avoiding the Gothic ecclesiasticism of which the working man is supposed to be afraid.

"Clubland", built by the Methodists in Walworth in 1929 (a major casualty of the *Blitz*), was not only a beautifully equipped

centre for Youth, but a home of the soul. Mr. Edward Maufe, the architect of Guildford Cathedral, gave this church the spaciousness, repose, and colour that are so lacking in the crowded streets. The green and blue ceiling harmonizes with warm buff walls, silver and gold panels; tall windows, slightly Swedish in shape, were filled with tinted glass that changes in colour according to the light. Another experiment to help Youth in the quest for Beauty is "Little Church", Ealing — the children's chapel of Ealing Congregational Church. Light, peace and harmony are suggested by a white interior, an arcaded vista and a golden cross hanging on a blue curtain at the east end. One must also mention the beautiful Youth Chapel designed by Mr. Ibberson at Penge Congregational Church; its symbolism is the fruit of much thought, yet it glows with imagination and life.

If the House of God is the house *in excelsis,* more might be done to express architecturally the values which the Puritans sought to embody in their meeting houses[8]. Lutyens has embodied this "domestic ideal" in his Free Church at the Hampstead Garden Suburb. Such simplicity and good taste could surely be developed in village chapels, in place of the local builder's "Gothic". In towns, it seems a pity that the gradual disappearance of the florid and insincere type of chapel façade in stucco Baroque should mean the abandonment of the classical style. The early 18th century meeting houses were often successful in blending classic taste with domestic feeling. New Lendal Chapel, Burton Stone Lane, York, is a small but dignified example of what can be done (Illingworth & Son, Bradford, 1934), while Mr. P. Morley Horder found inspiration in the old meeting houses for his interior of Cheshunt College Chapel, Cambridge.

The post-war period will be marked by financial stringency. But many Free Churches that have been bombed will have to be rebuilt — notably the City Temple, which one hardly imagines being replaced in replica. Older and nondescript buildings will have to be renovated in keeping with modern conceptions of reverent worship. I would not care to hazard prophecies of post-war Church Architecture, but this may be said. If lack of funds rules out expensive churches in period styles, and Christian taste and sense rule out buildings that merely symbolize machinery and power, there is room for a variety of styles that will be rooted in past experience and will grow out of the soil of Liberal Evangelicalism, to produce the fruits of worship, religious nurture, and Christian fellowship.

[8] See my article, "The Architectural interest of the English Meeting House" (*R.I.B.A. Journal,* 15 Aug., 1938). The more interesting examples are in Unitarian hands. Argyle Chapel, Bath (Congregational), though not distinctive, shows how worshipful a simple meeting house interior can be if the colour scheme is harmonious and the arrangement of choir, pulpit, *etc.,* well thought out.

ISAAC NEWTON: THE DIFFIDENT SCIENTIST

By the Rev. Cyril T. Follett, B.A.

When some ten years ago the B.B.C. went in search of the nine persons who had most influenced the lives of men and had chiefly contributed to the shaping of the so-called "modern spirit", Isaac Newton was found to be one of them. There is good reason for his inclusion. Even amid war conditions men of science will be celebrating Newton's tercentenary towards the end of this year, and doubtless many readers of this journal also will mark the passing of this 300th anniversary.

Very much the child of his age in religious matters, Isaac Newton accepted uncritically most of the dogmas of the Church save perhaps the doctrine of the Trinity, by which indeed he was somewhat perplexed. He regarded religious subjects as of supreme importance, but, though he applied his genius to the Scriptural data concerning Solomon's temple and produced an elaborate description of it in one of his works, and though he spent much time and labour on the apocalyptic literature, his religious writings were of small importance. It was his scientific work, which he himself regarded as of only secondary value, that established him as one of the most significant men who ever lived.

Newton was born at Woolsthorpe, Lincolnshire, on Christmas Day, 1642. His father died before his birth, and he was prematurely born, an explanation perhaps of the fact that, as his mother often told him, he was so small at birth that he could be put into a quart pot, and so weak that for some time a support was placed about his neck to carry his head. Yet when he died on 20th March, 1727, he had reached the age of eighty-four years. He had lost but one tooth, retained keen eyesight to the last, and also great sensitiveness in his hands. He had remained a bachelor, which perhaps explains his longevity!

There was nothing in Newton's ancestry to lead anyone to expect anything unusual in his career. In 1654 he was sent to school at Grantham, where he did nothing more exceptional than to make ingenious contrivances to mark the passage of time, and such things as a water-clock and a model windmill. He spent four years here, then was brought home to be a farmer, but, showing no inclination for the land in two years, he was sent back to Grantham to prepare for Cambridge. He entered Trinity College in 1661. From then until 1687 his life is a record of studies, inven-

tions, and the publication of his writings. He made three of the greatest discoveries in the history of science during two amazing years, 1665—1667, when, like other students, he had been driven home from Cambridge by the great plague. These discoveries we shall presently enumerate, but, to continue for the moment the record of his distinctions, he became Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge in 1669. It was whilst he held this post that he, with other deputies, appeared before the notorious Judge Jeffreys because they refused consent to the abrogation of one of the University rules. He became Member of Parliament for Cambridge in 1689, was appointed Warden of the Mint in 1696, and Master in 1699. He was elected and remained President of the Royal Society for twenty-five years. He was knighted by Queen Anne in 1705, thus becoming the first man of science to be so honoured *qua* scientist.

There were several curious features about Newton's genius. His appointment to the Mint seems a strange one for a man of his scientific ability, yet, though he took over the Mint at a time of peculiar difficulty, he made a great success of it and, incidentally, proved himself to be above all corruption. There was that choice occasion, for instance, when he refused a proffered bribe of £6,000. The agent offering the bribe threatened Newton, declaring that he was the representative of a Duchess of great quality and influence. To which Newton replied, "I desire you to tell the lady that if she was here herself and had made me this offer, I would have desired her to go out of my house, and so I desire you or you shall be turned out". Newton took this appointment as Master of the Mint because it enabled him to live, but also because it satisfied his interest in the possible transmutation of metals. His interest in this subject, placed alongside his later interest in the possible existence of a philosopher's stone and in an elixir of life, indicates a curious weakness in a man with such outstanding mathematical knowledge. The second unusual feature about Newton's genius is psychological and reveals itself in a certain resentment against his own gifts. He was capable of amazing feats of concentration and could discern the thread of truth amidst a mass of irrelevancy; but he never considered his results as of any primary interest. Other matters than those in which his genius lay were regarded popularly as of more importance, so that Newton himself, and most of his contemporaries, failed to realize the vast significance of his discoveries. His genius constrained him to explore the framework of man's environment, but he felt that the proper and urgent field of inquiry lay in the meanings of life itself. He regarded his own efforts as dealing with only secondary issues, hence his zeal lasted only long enough to enable him to elicit facts and to deduce certain principles from them. In support of this statement, we may note

that on his appointment his scientific work almost ceased; that he expected no public fame to accrue to himself on account of his discoveries; and lastly, that his friends had great difficulty in persuading him to publish his work. When he did publish it, he often did so anonymously and, sometimes, years after his discoveries had been made. Had he published his results as soon as he had reached them, he might have avoided some of the controversies that gathered about him, for instance with that brilliant man Leibnitz. As a man blessed with a musical genius might despise his own gift because he considers great painting as the most desirable gift of all, so Newton seems almost to have resented his own genius since it expressed itself in a field which he judged to be of comparative unimportance.

We have observed Newton's diffidence in publishing his discoveries. The most important of them all, the differential calculus, he kept to himself as a sort of private mathematical device for solving certain types of problem. It was his secrecy here that led to his controversy with Leibnitz. In June, 1696, an able mathematician, John Bernoulli, challenged all comers to solve two difficult problems: they were genuine problems, but seem to have been designed also to discover whether Newton knew as much as people suspected he did. Six months were allowed for the solution of the two problems. Leibnitz solved one of them, and then asked for twelve months in which to solve the other. Now, Leibnitz possessed a first-class brain, but the positive genius of Newton becomes apparent when we learn that he received the problems on 29th January, 1697, and sent off his solutions on the next day.

The most important of Newton's discoveries may be grouped into three—the Composition of Light, the Law of Gravitation, and the Differential Calculus. To take them in that order, all previous theories of light had supposed that white light was the basic element, and that all coloured lights were modifications of it, but Newton completely reversed these theories by proving that the colours of the spectrum were basic and that white light was the combination of them. Secondly, concerning the law of gravitation, it should be recalled that whilst both Galileo and Kepler helped to pave the way for Newton's discoveries, the generality of men supposed an object in motion to be moved by some mystic force within itself. Even a cannon-ball was thought to be urged forward by some mysterious inherent agent. What gravitation is in itself probably no one knows even today, but what Newton did was to establish the rules which it obeys, and to make calculations by which the powers of attraction or magnetism in heavenly bodies as well as those in the earth itself could be known. Newton's third achievement, the differential calculus, does not lend itself to popular exposition. We can do no better here than to give a

definition once offered by Prof. H. Levy. He calls it "a method of finding the speed and acceleration of a moving body from a knowledge of its position at successive instants of time". That definition will give us the general idea. Our purpose here is served if we say that in his calculus Newton gave to the world a mathematical formula without which many of the most important efforts of human ingenuity in modern times could never have been exploited.

We may now summarize Newton's specific contribution to the "modern spirit". He gave to the world what is called the purely scientific outlook. Scientists are popularly supposed to approach their work in a coldly analytical spirit which presses on to the issues of a research unmoved by either prejudice or desire, while maintaining a wholly unemotional attitude. This attitude, as consciously adopted, was little known before the days of Newton. His mind seems to have been particularly glacial as he approached his work, and therein, doubtless, lies the secret of his success. He set down the rules of the game, as it were, and those rules still govern all efforts in scientific research.

Lastly, Newton laid the mathematical foundation upon which the towering superstructure of our scientific age has been erected. Whilst at work on the composition of light he used experiments which gave the world a means of measuring light; his work on gravitation enabled men to understand the movements of heavenly bodies, to establish the fact that the earth's crust is flattened at the north and south poles, and to solve the puzzle of how the tides of the sea are influenced by the magnetism of sun and moon. His mathematical formulæ mark the beginnings of almost all our scientific advance in the last two and a half centuries.

In conclusion, we may like to remember again that well-known saying of Newton's, uttered a short while before his death:

> I do not know what I may appear to the world; but to myself I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the seashore, diverting myself now and then in finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary whilst the great ocean of Truth lay all undiscovered before me.

BEGINNING OF THE GREAT ADVENTURE

THE BIRTH OF THE LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

By the Rev. HUGH W. THEOBALD, M.A.

MISSIONARY education and propaganda concern themselves so largely with the stories of the apostolic heroes of the field and with the problems and opportunities of today, that one fine chapter in the story is neglected—the first chapter, telling of the actual founding of the Society, through which alone all those triumphs of faith have been won. This is of particular interest now in view of the approaching Triple Jubilee of the L.M.S.

I think readers of the *Congregational Quarterly* might pass with credit an examination about the main facts concerning such great names as these: John Williams, James Chalmers, Robert Moffat, David Livingstone, John Smith, Vanderkemp, Gilmour, Robert Morrison; Griffith John, Ringletaube, A. W. Brough, David Jones, Kendal Gale, and Mabel Shaw; at least I hope we should.

But how should we fare if the names were: Haweis, John Eyre, David Bogue, Joseph Hardcastle, William Shrubsole, John Love, Waugh, Rowland Hill, and Matthew Wilks? Not so well, perhaps. Yet these men were mighty in faith, and the difficulties they faced and overcame were very much the same as those we face in our presentation of the missionary challenge in the home field.

In the early nineties of the eighteenth century there were factors that made the founding of a Missionary Society a difficult enterprise. People were deeply concerned with politics and war. Christendom was still staggering under the impact of the French Revolution. That tremendous uprising not only proclaimed the thrilling doctrines of the liberty, equality, and fraternity of men. It also repudiated all revealed religion and furiously attacked the Christian Church. At that time the French Revolution was far more disturbing than the Bolshevist Movement has been in our time for all its world-wide repercussions. Then, as now, war eclipsed every other interest in the public mind. The first great Anti-revolutionary Coalition was breaking down, and Britain was setting her teeth for a life and death struggle, that was to last, with little interruption, for a quarter of a century. At home, the social problems were tremendous and growing more and more acute. The land enclosure movement, the Industrial Revolution, and the rapid growth of population, were combining to increase both wealth and poverty, to set great populations on the move and to create the foul mushroom towns of the north and midlands. People

had some grounds for saying, "Have we not problems and tasks enough here, with the very foundations of society being shaken, with the country losing a desperate war, with our own new areas of social misery and practical heathenism? Why talk now about this quixotic nonsense of foreign missions?"

Against this argument there were other factors that encouraged the enterprise. Foreign trade and exploration were making people world-conscious as never before. The growth of trade was phenomenal. Exports, which in 1758 had amounted to just over six millions, leaped, in 1810 to nearly £46,000,000.

It is significant that the L.M.S. was virtually founded in two great ports, Bristol and London. Men thought "If the world is now our field for commercial activity, why not for Christian adventure also?" Had not John Wesley declared that the world was his parish? The publication between 1771 and 1782 of the records of Captain Cook's voyages thrilled the country. He opened a window into a new world, a world of vast oceans, dotted with islands of paradisiacal beauty peopled by races of noble and handsome physique. To some far-seeing Christians it appeared a God-given field for evangelism.

Another great factor creating and encouraging Christian adventurers was the Evangelical Revival led by John and Charles Wesley and George Whitefield. This was sweeping on and bringing new spiritual life to the older Christian bodies as well as to the new Methodist Connexion. The Independent Churches, in particular, though they retained their Calvinistic theology, were being re-born in this Pentecostal experience. "And so", to quote Silvester Horne,

> in the providence of God, men were raised up who bade the Church remember that the best way to meet the attacks of its foes is not by adopting a defensive, but an aggressive attitude. Christianity itself had been challenged; the new missionary policy was a bold and trumpet-toned acceptance of that challenge.

Let us follow in more detail the steps that led to the founding of the Society. Among the older Dissenting Bodies the credit for the first move forward belongs for ever to the Baptists. On 21st May, 1792, William Carey preached at Nottingham, before a gathering similar to those of our District Union Meetings, his great sermon on *Is.* $54^{2,3}$:

> Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations; spare not; lengthen thy cords and strengthen thy stakes. For thou shalt spread abroad on the right hand and on the left and thy seed shall possess the nations and make the desolate cities to be inhabited.

His theme was "Expect great things from God; attempt great things for God". The sermon made a deep impression, but Carey wanted more than deep impressions; he wanted action. As the congregation began to disperse he seized Andrew Fuller's arm and cried out, "And are you, after all, going again to do nothing?"

The result was the foundation of the Baptist Missionary Society and the departure for India a year later of William Carey and John Thomas. We are tempted sometimes to think that sermons are mere talking and that they achieve nothing practical. That sermon at least was one of the great events in the history of humanity.

Carey, like many missionaries, was a good letter writer. One of his first letters from abroad reached a Dr. Ryland of Bristol, who showed it to three of his friends, James Stevens, a Presbyterian minister in London, David Bogue and John Hey, Congregational ministers respectively in Gosport and Bristol. As a result, the four friends met in the parlour of the Tabernacle at Bristol for prayer and to discuss ways of arousing missionary interest among Independents. The first outcome of the meeting was a paper by Bogue published in the *Evangelical Magazine* and addressed to "The Evangelical Dissenters who practise Infant Baptism". In this Bogue seeks to sting his brethren into a sense of shame because while Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Scotch Presbyterians, Methodists, Moravians, and Baptists were already at work in the Mission field, the Independents were doing nothing for the evangelization of the heathen. He also makes the significant suggestion that a Seminary should be established for training missionaries.

David Bogue was a scholarly minister of good standing. He was a man of glowing enthusiasm (he volunteered to go abroad himself when he was about fifty) and of sound judgment. From the outset he disapproved of sending out untrained enthusiasts, a policy which led to disaster and tragedy in Tahiti. When the Society had learned the lesson of that tragic mistake, it asked Bogue himself to carry on a Missionary Seminary. This he consented to do and was its Principal for years. The quality of his training and influence may be judged from the fact that his students included Robert Morrison of China, W. C. Loveless and John Hands of South India, David Jones and David Griffiths of Madagascar. He was also one of the founders of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and of the Religious Tract Society.

Another movement of note happened in a Ministers' Fraternal in Warwickshire. On 27th July, 1793, the brethren met to discuss the question, "What is the duty of Christians with respect to the spread of the Gospel?" They resolved,

> That it is the duty of all Christians to employ every means in their power to spread the knowledge of the Gospel both at

> home and abroad; that we unite in a determination to promote this great design in our respective Connexions; that we will immediately recommend to our friends the formation of a fund for the above purpose; that the first Monday of every month at seven o'clock in the evening be a season fixed for united prayer to God for the success of every attempt by all denominations of Christians for the spread of the Gospel.

Afterwards, Dr. E. Williams of Carrs Lane drew up a circular letter, and a collection was made amounting to £5 5s. 0d. So our researches have discovered a good word not only for sermons but for ministers' fraternals.

Meanwhile, things were happening in London too. Two leading ministers there, John Eyre, an Anglican clergyman in Homerton, and Matthew Wilks, of Whitefield's Tabernacle, called a meeting of ministers at Baker's Coffee House, Cornhill, to consider the practicability of founding a new missionary society. The meeting was highly successful, and it was decided to call other and larger meetings at the Castle and Falcon Inn, Aldersgate Street. John Love was appointed provisional secretary, and George Burder drew up an address of which 15,000 copies were distributed throughout the country. Finally, it was decided to hold a general conference in September, 1795, for the actual founding of a Society.

Another leading spirit who must be mentioned is Dr. Haweis, an Anglican clergyman and chaplain to the Countess of Huntingdon. He was deeply concerned about the needs for missionary work. At one time he made an offer in the *Evangelical Magazine* to give £500 "for the equipment of the first missionaries who should be sent out on this blessed service". He strongly supported the project of establishing an undenominational "Missionary Society", and it was partly due to him and Eyre that the L.M.S. was from the outset not a distinctly Congregational body.

The mention of George Burder is of special interest to me. Once I had to supervise the troubled life of a little church in South India. The pastor and his wife had quarrelled violently. Some members supported one, some the other; most were against both. My first step was to reconstitute the diaconate, and in particular, to get in a greatly respected old high-school master of the name of Burder. I have no doubt that he was, as it were, a spiritual grandchild of George Burder of Coventry, one of the founders of the L.M.S.

I wish there were time to quote at length from Burder's printed address. A few sentences must suffice to show that he was of the fellowship of Eager-heart:

> Modern discoveries in geography have perhaps contributed to enlarge the desires of Christians in this respect. Captain

> Cook and others have traversed the globe, almost from pole to pole, and have presented to us, as it were, a new world, a world of islands in the vast Pacific Ocean—some of them as promising in the disposition of the people as in the appearance of the country. May we not reasonably hope that a well-planned and well-conducted mission to one or more of these, seconded with the earnest prayers of thousands of British Christians, will be attended with the blessing of God and issue in the conversion of many souls? Cook and other navigators have voluntarily exposed their lives in unknown tracts, in fields of ice and in the abodes of savages. And are there not yet among us, numbers of ministers and pious youths, who would gladly fly to the ends of the earth, bearing with them the glad tidings of salvation?

Burder later became one of the secretaries of the Society. The September meetings in London at which the Society was constituted must have been most inspiring. Meetings and services went on almost continuously, save at night, from Monday to Friday. At the first gathering a collection was taken and £740 was raised. When a resolution in favour of proceeding to institute the Society was passed unanimously, those present were so overcome with joy that they could scarcely attend to business.

On Thursday the first offer of service was accepted, from Captain James Wilson, that romantic figure—former soldier, prisoner of Tippu Sahib, seaman, and merchant-captain, now country gentleman. He undertook to take a party of missionaries out to the South Seas.

At the last meeting, on the Friday, Directors were elected and a Treasurer appointed. A marvellous choice was made in the person of Joseph Hardcastle, a godly, far-seeing London merchant. He was a member of the Clapham sect, a close friend of the slave emancipators, Wilberforce and Clarkson, and like them an evangelical Anglican. It was in his office that, later, the Religious Tract Society and the Bible Society were formed.

Beside the business meetings, many services were held and no fewer than five sermons preached. The record of these shows, I think, that though the worthy preachers knew nothing of the Higher Criticism, they could hit the target every time in their choice of a text. Haweis preached first, on *Mk.* $16^{15,16}$, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature". Then came Burder on *Jonah* 3^{2}, "Arise, go unto Nineveh, that great city, and preach unto it the preaching that I bid thee". Hey, of Bristol, took *Eph.* 1^{10}, "That in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth; even in Him". Rowland Hill came back to the Gospels with *Mt.* 24^{14}, "And this gospel

of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come".

Finally, Bogue dealt with the objections to foreign missions from the delicious text, *Haggai* 1[2], "Thus speaketh the Lord of Hosts, saying, this people say, the time is not come, the time that the Lord's house should be built". He dealt with ten objections, some of which have a very modern ring about them:

1. The work is so arduous that success cannot be hoped for.
2. The time for the conversion of the heathen is not yet come, because the millennium is still at the distance of some hundred years.
3. What is there in the state of the Christian Church at present that flatters with peculiar hopes of success for a mission to the heathen? Many ages have elapsed and little has been done; what makes the time now so favourable? Are we better than our fathers?
4. The governments of the world will oppose the execution of the Society's plans and defeat its design.
5. The present state of the heathen world is so unfavourable with respect to religion that little hope can be entertained of success.
6. How and where shall we find proper persons to undertake the arduous work of missions to the heathen?
7. Whence will the Society and the missionaries be able to find support?
8. There is no door opened by Providence for the entrance of the Gospel. We should wait till such an event takes place, and then diligently improve it.

   The last two objections are very old friends:

9. What right have we to interfere with the religion of others?
10. We have heathen enough at home, let us convert them first before we go abroad.

One point in the sermon worthy of note is Bogue's citing of the L.M.S. as an example of Christian unity. These were his words, greeted at the time with the greatest enthusiasm:

> We have now before us a pleasing spectacle, Christians of different denominations, although differing in points of Church government, uniting in forming a Society for propagating the Gospel among the heathen. This is a new thing in the Christian Church. . . . Here are Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians and Independents all united in one Society, all joining to form its laws, to regulate its institutions and manage its various concerns. Behold us here assembled, with one accord, to attend the funeral of bigotry; and may she be buried so deep that not a particle of her dust may ever be thrown upon the face of the earth. I could almost add, cursed be the man who shall attempt to raise her from the grave.

The L.M.S. founders did indeed deal bigotry some hard blows. They named the new body simply "The Missionary Society" and declared, "The sole object is to spread the knowledge of Christ among heathen and other unenlightened nations". They affirmed it

> to be a fundamental principle of the Missionary Society, that our design is not to send Presbyterianism, Independency, Episcopacy, or any other form of Church order and government (about which there may be differences of opinion among serious persons) but the glorious Gospel of the blessed God to the heathen.

The L.M.S. constitution and tradition are still in accord with that fine manifesto. But Bogue was, alas, premature in his rejoicing over the demise of bigotry. It dies hard, if such a vigorous serpent may be said to show any signs of dying at all.

The story is almost told. The Society was founded, and in spite of all difficulties, great enthusiasm was aroused and adequate funds raised.

The second chapter opened with the most grievous disappointments. The good ship *Duff,* carrying 30 missionaries, 6 wives and 3 children, reached the Society Islands all right; but there the realities proved far different from the dreams of the zealots. The crude, cruel heathenism of the islanders was too much for most of the missionaries, who were for the most part quite untrained for the undertaking. Some escaped to New South Wales, some "went native", some were massacred. After twelve years, the four remaining pioneers had to flee from Tahiti to a safer island. There they hung on, and in 1812 the tide turned with the conversion of King Pomare. Those years of failure and tragedy were a sad repayment for the efforts and sacrifices of the founders of the Society. The second expedition never reached the field at all. Their ship was captured by the French, and only after months of privation did the distressed missionaries arrive at home again.

In view of these setbacks, the faith and constancy of the Directors was beyond praise. They hung on, gave on, prayed on, and the ship weathered the storm.

A list of L.M.S. stations in 1820 is full of interest. To those who know something of geography, of the tremendous difficulties in getting Mission stations started at all, and of the perils and slowness of communication in those days, the bare list should be more eloquent than any peroration:

South Seas.

Tahiti, Eimeo, Raiatea, Huaheine. (Two notable names on the staff list are Henry Nott, bricklayer, scholar and statesman, one of the original pioneers, and John Williams.)

Ultra Ganges.

Canton (Dr. Robert Morrison), Malacca, Penang, Java, Singapore, Amboyna.

East Indies.

Calcutta, Chinsurah, Benares, Vizagapatam, Madras, Bellary, Bangalore, South Travancore, Surat.

Russia.

Sarepta and Selenginsk in Siberia.

Greek Mission.

Zante and Malta.

Africa.

Seven stations within the colony, and five beyond the colony, stretching as far as Africaner's Kraal, where Robert Moffat was.

African Islands.

Mauritius and Madagascar (temporarily unoccupied).

West Indies.

Demerara, Berbice, Trinidad.

"And these all", founders and pioneers, "having obtained a good report, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect".

The Livingstone Press has issued two very readable volumes, the Rev. E. A. Payne's *The Church Awakes* and Miss Margaret Wrong's *Five Points for Africa* (2s. 6d. each). Mr. Payne tells the story of the modern missionary movement in an attractive way, though we do not like his scheme: half-way through the book we come to "Forerunners" and "We begin with Francis Xavier". Miss Wrong, with many effective illustrations, shows how the five standards of the leaders of the Churches could be applied to Africa.

An excellent "Pelican" (9d.) is Dr. A. C. Bouquet's *Comparative Religion*. The Epilogue and Bibliography are worth many times the cost of the book in themselves.

Mr. J. B. Coates's *A Common Faith or Synthesis* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) suffers from undue reliance on other writers and from some repetition. His synthesis co-ordinates religion, politics, science, and art, and his general position is that of Sir Richard Acland. Some of his contentions are already out of date, and his references to India make strange reading. He desires a statement of war aims, an appeal to the German people, a negotiated peace, some form of federal union, and an attempt to start here and now the new social order we desire after the war. It is not quite clear what Mr. Coates means by "religion", but see "Worth Noting".

A STUDY OF UNSUSPECTED MOTIVES BEHIND THE CURES OF JESUS

By the Rev. Edwin E. Le Bas.

No words are more appropriate to the healing activities of Jesus than those chosen by Matthew (8^{17}), "Himself took our infirmities, and bare our diseases". Underlying them is a clear recognition of a deep and abiding compassion in the heart of Jesus for every sufferer. The crowd called it forth as readily as the individual. "I have compassion on the multitude", sprang as spontaneously to His lips, as when, "being moved with compassion", He said to the leper, "I will; be thou made clean" (*Mk.* 8^{2}; 1^{41}). So unreservedly—and rightly so—do we attribute this lofty motive to Jesus, that the immediate reaction to the suggestion that other motives may, at times, be present in these healing miracles is one of painful denial. The complexity and depth of the nature of Jesus, however, are such that on *a priori* grounds we have no right to refuse to entertain this possibility. The theory of compound motivation behind some of the cures of Jesus may be unusual; this does not prove it unfounded.

There can be, here as elsewhere, no sure ground for a final interpretation of His activities than a critical but reverent examination of the few scattered records we happen to possess. The sphere is, admittedly, of exceptional difficulty; we must be content, therefore, to take the natural explanation of situations we meet, and, further, to avoid more precise, highly defined, technical terminology. We confine ourselves, moreover, to the Synoptic record. From all the individual cures therein narrated—a score in all—the following few cases emerge, to each of which a brief preliminary reference is needed. It will be in the subsequent statement of characteristics common to these few cures that the presence of compound motives will, probably, be more clearly seen.

Every reader would readily admit the compound nature of the impelling motives behind the cure of the palsied man (*Mk.* 2^{3-12}; *Mt.* 9^{2-8}; *Lk.* 5^{18-26}). Quite apart from the sympathy of Jesus, shown alike in the cure of the soul as in that of the quivering frame, it is patent that the healing by Jesus of the body is treated by Him as authenticating His authority to forgive sins. The disclosure by Jesus of this additional motive is so emphatic that it must prepare us for its presence, even in cases where the veil is not expressly lifted by Him.

The healing of Malchus, though perhaps not so explicit an in-

stance, is yet illuminating. It was, we may safely assume, imperative that Jesus should check any further blow by His over-eager disciple, also by the unnamed holder of the second sword (*Lk.* 22[38]), quite apart from preventing any reprisal by the armed guard. It was also urgent that Jesus should at once remove any suspicion that He was leading a revolutionary movement, a vital point He was careful to stress later in His defence before Pilate (*Jn.* 18[36]). Hence the instructional warning, "all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (*Mt.* 26[52]); likewise, the peremptory command to Peter to sheathe his sword (*Mt.* 26[52]). These measures, though constructive contributions to peace, are only partially so. They do not, clearly, repair the injury done. Apparently, therefore, the healing of the ear not only exhibits compassion, but also serves as an immediate, positive proof of the pacifist motive of Jesus. The cure clinches the command.

We turn to further instances—as seen on the Sabbath. Jesus is teaching in the synagogue of Capernaum. While He is the focus of attention, doubtless while actually speaking, a demoniac startles the assembled congregation by stressing the personality of Jesus. "Hold thy peace . . . ", is the immediate rejoinder of Jesus. Compassion is present, for there follows the words of exorcism. But the initial command is, we suggest, disciplinary (*Mk.* 1[23-26]; *Lk.* 4[33-35]).

The Pharisees are not yet in evidence. But they rapidly become alert—critical, hostile. We shall notice, presently, the deep significance of this fact. We can thus group together three Sabbatic cures, in which the religious authorities are involved—the man with the withered hand (*Mk.* 3[1-6]; *Mt.* 12[9-14]; *Lk.* 6[6-11]), the deformed woman (*Lk.* 13[11-17]), and the dropsical patient (*Lk.* 14[1-6]).

It is well known that Rabbinical regulations forbade any relief of suffering on the Sabbath, save in cases of extreme urgency. The attitude of Jesus in these Sabbatic cures has thus often been taken as a severe castigation of the callousness, not only of these provisions, but of their official exponents. It is very doubtful, however, if this view does justice to the impelling motive of Jesus. Passionately desirous as He was of alleviating the lot of all sufferers on the Day of Rest, Jesus knew that any such relief could only come from the very men opposed to Him. Rebuke there was, certainly, but did no passion of the reformer and of the teacher quicken Him? It was surely no idle tribute which led men to accord Him the title of "Rabbi". A close study, accordingly, of these particular cures, treated as a composite scene, will reveal, we believe, the unmistakable presence of a pedagogic motive.

The authorities are expecting a miracle based on compassion *alone*, similar to those on the weekday, with which they are

familiar. The direct, fearless question of Jesus, "Is it lawful on the Sabbath day to do good or to do evil?" immediately, however, transforms the situation. To their bewilderment, the cure of the sufferer is definitely side-tracked. Whether ordered to stand forth, as in one case, or not, as in another, is alike indifferent; he is no more than a passive illustration of a fresh principle Jesus is introducing into the cure. Otherwise the invalid might not be there at all, so utterly does Jesus ignore him. The Pharisees (originally present as observers, intent on gathering evidence of the violation of the Sabbath day) are now forced, unexpectedly, to take the patient's place in the centre of the stage. They are compelled to face a dilemma which previously had never struck them. Jesus is not only concerned about their exaggerated reverence for the Day of Rest, but He is forcing them, constructively, to consider the reasonableness of Sabbatic healing. In startling vividness He brings home to them the utterly illogical position of freely granting relief to their beasts while at the same time denying it to their brethren. They are made to shoulder the onus of postponing help for even one day longer than is needed. There is no escape from this forensic dilemma save in silence. With their obvious discomfiture ends the vitally reformative aspect of the encounter. Jesus thereupon, *but not before,* turns back to the sufferer and heals him. Viewed dramatically, though not compassionately, one might almost say that this closing cure is in the nature of an anti-climax. The compassionate miracles of Jesus were comparatively frequent; the pedagogic element in the cures extremely rare.

It will be noted that, in the foregoing cures, the compassionate motive finds expression, as always, in the act of healing. But this serves, in these instances, as a demonstration of the precept just enunciated. And this principle is, in turn, not simply judicial and condemnatory, but instructional and reformative. The two aspects are thus in intimate dependence upon each other, the didactic word and the sympathetic act. This feature is absent from the remaining cures of Jesus. The fusion of these compound motives thus adds irresistible power and cogency to the lesson taught.

Two further features, intimately connected with this type of cure, are so striking as, materially, to enhance its significance.

It is almost invariably the additional, invading motive which, by overriding the sentiment of compassion, is the first to seek expression. This is true whether the cure take place on the Sabbath, or on the Jewish weekday. In the cure of the palsy, for instance, A. D. Martin, noticing this order, writes[1]:

> The word of forgiveness was spoken first and the word of healing was added as a sort of corollary. . . .

It is also present, inferentially, though not explicitly so, in the cure

[1] *A Plain Man's Life of Christ,* 70.

of Malchus. The stinging rebuke to Peter to sheathe his sword is strikingly different, both in tone and urgency, from the courteous request addressed to the servant of the high priest, "Permit me thus far" (*Lk.* 22[51]—Weymouth), which is, perhaps, the most conventionally polite phrase we have from the lips of Jesus. There is no reasonable doubt which utterance comes first. Such cases as the healing of the demoniac, of the man with the withered hand, of the dropsical patient, all show that the intrusion of the outside motive is marked by a greater immediate dynamic than that of the more static compassionate impulse. Pedagogically speaking, principle precedes proof.

The healing of the deformed woman places, it is true, the cure first, and the instructional rebuke second. This may well be an exception to the general rule. On the other hand, it is equally probable that Jesus, who would have noticed the sufferer during the service, and had ample time before it ended to plan His cure, decided to heal the woman at the close, giving the ruler (who is not stated to have been, like the Pharisees, critically observant) the opportunity courteously to remain silent. Jesus, however, is fully prepared for the worst, and, when it happens, He has no alternative save instantly to justify His action. In every other case, however, the more slowly moving compassionate cure is temporarily shunted, only resuming its journey after the express has passed.

A further noteworthy characteristic of this type of healing miracle must also be mentioned. In the cures which are strictly compassionate Jesus, sound psychologist that He is, invariably allows the sufferer or friend to make the first approach to Him for help. Where, however, the motivation is compound, the additional motive is so powerful that it not only takes precedence of the sympathetic impulse, but also leads Jesus to anticipate the invalid, and Himself to take the initiative in the cure.

Thus, we find Jesus approaching Malchus on the weekday, and, on the Sabbath, the demoniac, the man with the withered hand[2], the deformed woman, and the dropsical patient. Even if the somewhat churlish accusation of the ruler of the synagogue were true, and the woman had come hoping to be healed, it was still Jesus who took the determinative step in calling the woman to His side. The one exception to this feature, and obviously so, is the cure of the palsied man, although, as just mentioned, it is true to type in that the pedagogic motive claims priority.

[2] In the apocryphal *Gospel according to the Hebrews* it is said the man appealed to Jesus for help. This would have been, in the presence of the Pharisees, highly improbable. Thus, if true, it implies that they, and not the sufferer, were responsible. As Martin suggests: "It may be that he was pushed, as it were, under the notice of Jesus" (*ib.*, 74-5). If a challenge, Jesus accepted it, and effectively turned the tables on His critics.

We would freely admit that the presence of the Day of Rest restricted general approach to Jesus for healing (*Mk.* 1^{32}). The only exception is that of Peter's mother-in-law, which is typically a compassionate cure (*Mk.* 1^{29-31}; *Mt.* 8^{14-15}; *Lk.* 4^{38-39}); and Peter would not have been Peter had he not, doubtless, been responsible for kicking over the traces in this one instance. In these compound motivated cures Jesus was, however, not seeking to help sufferers to override the Sabbatic code, for, as we have seen, the cure was His secondary objective. He took the initiative owing to the dynamic thrust of the primary motive.

All of these striking characteristics, therefore, seem to be inextricably interwoven into the warp and woof of these few singular and outstanding cures, and effectively separate them from the normal procedure apparent in those which are dominated solely by sympathy. They thus serve as correlative proofs of the soundness of the psychological ground upon which they are selected. Viewed from this angle they are seen as a smaller but distinctive group, running parallel to the larger mass of compassionate cures in the healing ministry of Jesus.

In conclusion, we may well ask if there be any main purpose which Jesus, apparently, had before Him in the unusual procedure noticed in this remarkable group of cures? The question can, we believe, be satisfactorily answered. Dismissing the cure of the demoniac in the synagogue of Capernaum, and that of Malchus, both of which are exceptional, all the others revolve, it will be seen, around the presence of the ecclesiastical authorities. This fact, as already suggested, strikes the keynote to the basic aim of these significant miracles: they are seen to embody principles which are vital to the wider aims of the ministry of Jesus.

In what is, perhaps, the most important miracle in the series—the cure of the palsied man—Jesus, by openly forgiving sins, instantly opens the flood-gates of official suspicion and criticism. This attitude is quickened and intensified by His claim to remodel the basic principles in what was, perhaps, the most jealously safeguarded preserve of the Rabbinic law—the rules governing the Day of Rest. These exalted claims would, we hold, have been asserted only under the final urge and driving power of some supreme and all-embracing motive.

Jesus has, in fact, a deeper aim to serve than the immediate cure of the individual sufferers involved, important though this aim ever is. The cures are, we suggest, in the extraordinary cases we have been considering, transformed suddenly, but always, be it noted, temporarily, from the customary objective of relieving personal suffering, to serve as unique vehicles and proofs of His Messiahship. The compassionate impulse is, however, never dethroned. Rather, as a solitary queen, her reign is enriched and

strengthened by the advent of a majestic consort, who, while naturally taking precedence, none the less insists that the wishes of his regal partner shall presently be loyally observed. Thus it is that these striking pedagogic cures constitute the dramatic spear-head in the national appeal of Jesus. Upon the reception they encounter depends, very largely, the success or failure of His approach to the religious leaders of His day.

These new principles approach Judaism, however, at the very points on which it is most sensitive to change. They seem, and indeed are, revolutionary. Consequently, they prove anathema to the authorities. Directed, primarily, to winning the rulers to Himself, these cures and the implications with which they are charged sound the death-knell of His highest hopes. In refusing to entertain the claims which these miracles authenticate, the official leaders seal the rejection of their Messiah. It is not surprising, therefore, that immediately following one of these revolutionary cures, that of the man with the withered hand, we read, "the Pharisees went out, and straightway with the Herodians took counsel against him, how they might destroy him" (*Mk.* 3^{6}; *Mt.* 12^{14}; *Lk.* 6^{11}). It is this rejection, so painfully obvious in these few compound motivated cures, which leads, finally and inevitably, to Calvary. Whether Jesus foresaw this fatal ending or not, these dynamic cures, wrought triumphantly notwithstanding the antagonistic atmosphere of Pharisaic opposition, reveal, unlike His other cures, a marked and almost impatient initiative, the strivings of an inward urgency and intense psychic strain—the kindling of a fire within, "a baptism to be baptised with" (*Lk.* $12^{49\text{-}50}$)—which, ever impelling Jesus forward, only fully and utterly works itself out, and thereby fulfils its divine mission, in His final and unreserved acceptance of the Cross.

It is unfortunate that controversy has arisen about the late R. B. Mowat's *The American Venture* (Dakers, 12s. 6d.). Prof. Mowat's intention to add a concluding chapter on America in 1940-1 was never realized owing to his death in an aeroplane accident. Reviewers seized on this tragic occurrence to explain mistakes in the book as due to lack of final revision, but the publishers replied that Prof. Mowat had already passed the proofs. Had he read through his chapters before adding his epilogue he would no doubt have made corrections here and there, but provided that the reader is wary he will find the book a very useful survey, and it is readable, as we should expect from the previous writings of one whose career has been so lamentably cut short.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

"THE MODERN VESTRY".

A CONGREGATIONAL church, as an institution, is after the likeness of Gaul, divided into three parts, the pulpit, the vestry, and the pew, or the minister, the deacon, and the member. Much has been said and written concerning those who have "occupied" the pulpit and in a measure about those who have filled the pew, but the vestry, a peculiar annexe to a Congregational church, has been, except in minute books, unrecorded. The question is being asked today, Is it well with the pulpit? The same question is being seriously discussed today about the pew, but must we not also ask, Is it well with the vestry? For one reason, there is nothing in the *modus operandi* of the churches that can actually be compared to a Board of Deacons, the board-room of which is the vestry. The province of the vestry has always been to watch over the spiritual life of the church, and to manage its financial and commercial affairs. What stories the walls of a church vestry could unfold had they had ears, what tragedies narrowly averted, what successes gained; but what passes in the vestry is for the vestry alone.

During the Golden Age of Congregationalism the Senior Deacon was an outstanding personality, a man of ripe spiritual experience. On the occasion of a "vacancy" he acted as "regent" and might be equal in an emergency to taking the minister's place; in early days he often shared with the minister the services on Sunday. One of the most sensitive relationships in the general life and work of the church has been that between the pulpit and the vestry, especially that between the minister and his senior deacon. No word in the nineteenth century parsonage was allowed to be spoken against the deacons: the pulpit might be discussed but not the vestry. So close was this friendship between minister and deacon that sons of the Manse were sometimes named after a deacon, especially if the name was well known in local and district church life. In northern cities and towns men were often found who were prominent both in civic and church life, and on occasion to an extent sufficient to influence civic policy. If the Golden Age of the pulpit was during the seventeenth century, that of the vestry was the nineteenth, when to be chosen as a deacon was held to be a very great honour and was never otherwise than seriously taken; the members of the vestry because of their office were held in something like honour. Their duties were spiritual.

With the closing years of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, a change moved over this tripartite scene of pulpit, vestry, and pew, and the vestry, hitherto very much of a constant, began to show signs of an alterity. The demand had been for an educated ministry, so called, a ministry equal to a place in the new age, with its scientific spirit and advancement of learning. The age of the "white tie" was threatened, clerical dress began to be the fashion. In due time, a new tone naturally sounded from the pulpit; many of the elder members complained "that the trumpet gave rather an uncertain sound". The gown appeared and later the university hood. In the services of the church the Lord's Prayer was chanted, and in certain churches some form of ritual was included in the order of service. To the present generation of young Congregationalists all these things are now familiar. The pew was left to adapt itself to these new forms and robes. The vestry, always sympathetic to the pulpit, left such matters largely to the pulpit. The large claim was made that these "ancient" forms of ritual, and the "modern" hymns, out of which ancient symbols were taken, voiced the feelings of the pew. The homely service, once the pride of Congregationalists, in which the sermon formed the central part, had gone.

The change that came over the vestry was of a more lingering kind, and of a more serious nature, appearing first of all, and gradually, in a change of personnel. An early symptom was the difficulty in finding men who felt themselves able to accept the responsibilities of a deacon; in the past a father was often followed by the son, which gave a sense of continuity. It ceased except in rare cases. The vestry, therefore, silently lost its Victorian and historical complexion. The more serious fact was that the type of churchmen which made the vestry of early days so significant was no longer found in the pew. Historic Congregationalism had attracted a type of man hard to define; from the Ebenezers, Bethels, Salems, Zions, and Rehoboths of those days came some of the best men, men who were thinkers, most sagacious leaders of industry and commerce, and sometimes men of iron will and firm character. Many can still remember those days of the vestry, and of the pulpit, but not without a silent sense of something lost and of great price that will never be recaptured. Was it the art of simplicity found throughout the Gospels? The preachers of those times live on in history, as well as in memory, but those who made the vestry, only in the memory of a diminishing number. But honour be to those who now carry on the work of the modern vestry, for ministers still come and still go to pastures new, the circulation has become more rapid, but the vestry remains in its place, and its work is at times to look round for "the right man for the place", for some golden-tongued Chrysostom who will recapture the past glory; but the vestry must also face diminishing attendances in the pew, and a falling income. But what of the night?

The answer that the vestry might give is, "Let the pew send us the men". The pew might also ask of the pulpit, where are the men of yesterday? The pulpit might refer all inquirers to the general situation, to the modern age. But has something of great moment gone or been for some reason lost—something of a mystic nature that existed between the three, the pulpit, the vestry, and the pew? A sympathy that was always manifest. The pulpit spoke in a way and with a sense that the pew understood, but with the change in the pulpit came a change of accent; a new view-point of the things most certainly believed in the pew. The dangers were not uniform; sometimes under the name of "a social gospel" truth was declared, in other places the new orientation of Biblical truth and rule.

But the pew had not the wherewithal clearly to follow. The "speaking with a tongue" needs an interpreter, and the interpreter was not at hand.

But, after all, a change is the result not of one cause but of many, the result is not simple but complex. Change is a principle of nature. To change is to live, but the process must be "without observation to all flesh", and must come with the change that responds, it must be "line upon line". Some ancient forms of belief still heard would, if changed, go far towards filling the pew. The pew itself has at long last become "educated", and no one who sees proportion in everything can accept a doctrine of eternal punishment, "a child of wrath", or even that church membership is absolutely necessary to salvation; for then what chance has the lumber man five hundred miles from a railway station and from a church any chance of eternal life? Is not a Christian in himself a miniature church? They ("the pew") know that the same day that Jesus entered Paradise, another also entered, but he was no saint; and more than a thief and robber. There is evidently a way even from the gates of Hell to the gates of Heaven. The Kingdom of God is not totalitarian, but a company of free men and women whose hearts the Lord has touched, for which a totalitarian state has no place. The love of God knows no limit; with Him all things are possible.

But hope abides, and is found in "the vestry", for the vestry remains when the pulpit is empty, and the pew but scantily filled. A century of great and magnificent attainments must needs, in a serial universe, be followed by one of apparent commonplace. The nineteenth century was preceded by the seventeenth century. "The Anatomy of Melancholy" is its memorial, and so in due course a change will creep over these hard times as far as religion is concerned, and no doubt a season of great profit to the mass of men. But what can be done to prepare the way in the desert? The world has always rejected those who came for the good of men. It is carefully to be remembered that the Truth was crucified. Since that day those who have sought after the peace of humanity have always been "despised and rejected of men", "men of sorrow and acquainted with poverty and grief", and even by those whose duty it is to love their neighbour. Paracelsus, who "wandered lonely as a cloud" over the fields of learning, carrying about with him his secret ether, said that "no man had a care for him except those to whom he applied his art of healing". Priestley of later times had his house burnt down by a Birmingham mob, and lost all his precious notebooks, and eventually, together with others, had to find safety in New England. The "Boston Dentist" who first successfully applied ether to a major operation, died in poverty; when ether parties were as common in America as wine parties in Oxford, those who had done so much to conquer pain were being persecuted and even excommunicated by the Church, for pain was a Divine dispensation. The prizes have gone to those who, on the other hand, have produced deadly weapons to destroy life rather than to save life. So has it ever been, but must history repeat itself? Pioneers are never popular. The coming change which all are hoping to see in the future of our faith and religion may creep into life from some obscure village and without a fanfare of trumpets; and it is possible into the Congregational churches with their great past and their reputation for freedom. But when the prophet comes, will he or his like find a welcome, and will the senior deacon in the vestry be able to advise his colleagues that the name of this new prophet be recommended to the pew as a suitable candidate for the pulpit?

C. M. Bainton.

PILGRIM PLACE: HEAVEN BELOW.

As I walked along a residential road in Bournemouth the other day my eyes rested with delight on the name of a house, "Thisyldo". Names of houses are often a matter *pour rire;* but this seemed admirable indeed; I thought of the man from Oldham or Huddersfield, his competence secure, looking for a place where he and his wife could spend their last years on earth, catching sight of this abode and ejaculating with conviction, "This'll do".

Missionaries and ministers rarely manage to save enough for comfort—is not the Pastors' Superannuation grant the magnificent sum of £60 a year? —and the problem of where and how they shall live when they retire presses all the more heavily upon them. In California there is a "Thisyldo" for ministers, and the sooner we duplicate it in England the better: there it is called "Pilgrim Place", though those who live in it describe it as "Heaven Below" and "Prelude to Paradise".

Pilgrim Place is in Claremont, a city (note the "city") of 3,000 people some thirty-five miles from Los Angeles, midway between the Pacific and mountains rising 10,000 feet. In Claremont there is a fine co-educational College, "Pomona", with 800 students; Scripps College for women, which, though you must not let them know, is made as much like an Oxford College as possible; and a Congregational Church which, though you will not expect me to name them, has 1,200 members of 27 different denominations.

Pilgrim Place began in a modest way in 1915. Now it is an estate of 20 acres, with its Alden and Plymouth Roads, its palm trees and orange groves, and the flowers California gives in such profusion. On it are already 39 buildings, and the number is steadily growing. There are five choices open to those who decide to retire to Pilgrim Place:

(1) Cottages or apartments may be had, completely furnished, at less than economic rentals.

(2) For single persons there are small modern apartments.

(3) The Mary H. Porter Hall offers furnished rooms, a dining room (open to all residents of Pilgrim Place), and a communal living room.

(4) Hadley House has 7 single apartments for women, with kitchenettes and private bathrooms.

(5) Last, and especially, there is the Co-operative Plan. Persons who wish to establish permanent homes in Pilgrim Place can build a house to designs approved by themselves and Pilgrim Place. The site is given free, and when the house is completed a life-lease is made out for the benefit of the builder—generally husband and wife and survivor. Fifteen houses have already been built under this plan.

The advantages of Pilgrim Place are so many that only those who enjoy them can describe them all. First there is the climate, and the beauty of the surroundings. Then there is congenial company, men and women who have spent their lives in the service of the Kingdom of God in many lands, with interests constantly renewed by new residents, missionaries on furlough, and their children. The Church and the Colleges, with lecturers known the world over, afford full scope for religious and intellectual interests. Then there is all that a modern house, with labour-saving devices and amenities, means to women-folk, good meals available near at hand without the labour of preparation, and care and attention in case of sickness.

And Pilgrim Place can give stimulus and help as well as receive it. Recently I saw there, among many other friends, Dr. G. A. Coe, pioneer in religious education; Dr. A. J. Covell, for many years Secretary of the Board of Pastoral Supply in Boston, for whose efficient and courteous help many British preachers have had reason to be grateful; and Dr. L. L. Wirt, known to many in England. As I write I am looking at the picture of the second house built in Pilgrim Place: three months ago its occupant pressed a five-dollar bill into my hand and said, "Spend this for some of the children of England".

Indeed this article ought to be illustrated, for pictures could tell the story far better than words. Instead of pictures, read what Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, of Broadway Tabernacle, wrote when he visited Pilgrim Place:

> One day I read about Pilgrim Place and believed in it. Later on I saw it with my own eyes and then I believed in it more. It is a beautiful thing to look at and a lovely thing to think about and a charming thing to remember. The central idea is inspiring and is worked out in a delightful location. It is inhabited by winsome human beings and is achieving a purpose in which heaven must rejoice. When I think of California, I think of the Yosemite and Pilgrim Place. The first is a masterpiece of God; the second is a masterpiece of man.

Where is the English Pilgrim Place to be? Sometimes I blush with shame when I learn how men and women who have served the churches with devotion for a life-time have to live in their old age. Once the war is over, cannot we remove this reproach? I wish I could take one or two Congregational millionaires to California and let them see what is possible. Once the scheme were started there would be little doubt of its success: many are those who would say with a blissful sign of content, "Thisyldo".

ALBERT PEEL.

P.S.—No, they are *not* all narrow and cantankerous and stuffy. One old lady of 85—she keeps house for a brother of 81—asked on returning from a luncheon in Pomona if she had had a good time, replied, "No. There was nobody there but a lot of fussy old women". Honesty, however, demands that I tell of the returned missionary who did not approve of her two more modern young daughters going to the movies. She said to a friend, "I cannot let the girls go to the movies, but tonight they inveigled me into letting them go to a play called a 'Preview' ".

Mr. W. L. White's *Journey for Margaret* (Hurst & Blackett, 7s. 6d.) is an American reporter's account of London in air-raids and of the little girl of three whom he adopted and took back to America. It is a moving story, with an interesting account of Miss Anna Freud's home in Hampstead for war orphans, where frightened and bomb-shocked children were nursed back to normal health.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS

TRAVELLING IN WARTIME.

No, this is to be about nothing so exciting—or so dull—as flying over the Atlantic or over the Rockies, zigzagging swiftly across the ocean in a lone liner, or plodding slowly across in a sedate convoy. It is not even about the first train journey in England after five months, a pleasant May Sunday afternoon ride from somewhere to London in a special train, with stations seemingly deserted, with the countryside looking as peaceful as in 1912, and with one's fellow-passengers, bewildered American Generals, eagerly peering out of the windows for their first view of bomb damage, beginning to wonder whether there was really a war on after all!

No, I am to write about nothing unusual, but merely about ordinary travel during a wartime summer, preaching journeys to Scotland and back, and the length and breadth of England a few times, those perfectly delightful trips about which people say, "Aren't you lucky to travel so much, a holiday every week?" It is, however, just because journeys have been too uncomfortable even to read, to say nothing of write, that there has been opportunity for observation and for these notes.

Writing on the last day of August, I cannot but begin by mentioning the inspiring vision of Britain's harvest: "fair waves the golden corn" is now more than the line of a hymn describing a far-off land, and the Board of Agriculture and our farmers are to be congratulated on a fine achievement. Never has our land produced so much or been dressed so beautifully. The discomfort of many a corridor has often been alleviated by the moving panorama without, and its promise that for another winter British children will not starve.

"Is your journey necessary?" From every side the question has been shouted at the civilian population for months. No doubt after their experiences this year many of them will answer the question with a determined negative, but in 1942 most people seem resolved to obtain a holiday of some sort. Not yet have the authorities fixed the distances that may be travelled. With so many lovely spots near to Glasgow it was surprising to find a not inconsiderable proportion of Glasgow's population invading the train at Preston after a week at Blackpool. A 50-mile limit on all holiday travel seems a reasonable war-time economy measure.

The peripatetic preacher has, in many ways, a thankless job at the present time, even if his conscience does not worry him about consuming other people's rations. No longer can he rely on his train arriving in time, a host to greet him, a swift ride home in a car, and a meal within a few minutes. Today he plans on being late; begs his host not to come to the station; hopes, generally in vain, that he may find a free taxi, especially if it be after dark in a strange town, or alternatively prays that it will be fine, that he will not have to stand too long in a bus queue, and that when he alights he will find he has been deposited in the right place! And when on Monday morning his time comes to depart he joins a queue already 200 yards long an hour before train time, thankful to secure a seat at all, and overflowing with goodwill if it happens to be a corner. Often too he is put into his place, and made to realize his insignificance in a wartime world. On Saturday at Waterloo the sheep were divided from the goats, and civilians were not allowed on the platform until all the "Services" had

found seats. Quite rightly too, though when I surveyed the length of the lines three abreast I began to wonder if Richmond Hill would find itself without preacher the following morning. Or he stands obediently in the bus line, to hear the challenging cry, "Workers first", and humbly begins to cross-examine himself and say, "Are *you* a worker? Is *your* journey really necessary?"

On the whole, my experience is that travellers are standing the strain remarkably well: cheerfulness generally breaks in, and tempers are rarely lost. While not unmindful of their problems, I wonder sometimes if taxi-drivers are coming through the test as well as their fares: I have seen some of them refuse to take aged and invalid people so that they might conserve petrol for night jobs when they could make exorbitant charges. Probably the number of these is as few as the number of people who pay these charges and so take the unfair advantage their wealth gives. I hope so, for in general the taxi-driver is as obliging as he is knowledgeable and witty.

It is always interesting to speculate on the trade or profession of one's fellow-passengers, and in these days one cannot help but wonder whether a man's religious profession affects his travel behaviour. Many smokers and fresh air fiends are as selfish and inconsiderate as has long been their wont —tobacco and fresh air are strangely akin in making their devotees oblivious to the comfort and rights of others. Non-smoking labels are almost invariably ignored, while the school-marm (to have a bad cold next week-end, for all her hygiene) still bounces into the carriage, and lets down the window with a bang, without so much as a "By your leave" or any regard for the direction of the wind or the state of the weather. I often wish that I had had some cards printed bearing an aphorism which has stuck in my mind from undergraduate days (what, I wonder, has become of the man who coined it—and many another?): "Cold air is not always fresh, and a draught is not always ventilation". But again these are exceptions, and most people show mutual consideration; they are resolved to make the best of a bad job, and to reach journey's end without undue exasperation. Newspapers are passed round, cigarettes are shared, and often food, while on long journeys some even rise to the height of offering their seats for a time to the unfortunates in the corridor. The other day a man joining the train in Glasgow for the north said he had stood all night all the way from London. That, I trust, is an unusual experience, though I have seen young people remain glued to their seats while older folk have been standing for hours. Could not the railway companies book all seats in advance and issue tickets to the number of seating capacity only? This is done in some areas, to the general advantage, and in wartime the practice should be universal. It might enable some check to be made on unnecessary journeys. For long distances, too, a packet of food should be issued to every passenger.

(And, while on suggested reforms, why not let every porter hear a record of his voice shouting the name of his station? In nine cases out of ten the noise is unintelligible: count the number you recognize the next time you have a train journey at night-time. Elocution teachers in our Colleges will soon have nothing to do. Here is an outlet for their energies.)

That is in parenthesis. Most travellers in these days are in uniform, and certainly meals should be provided for them on long journeys. If they had their own trains, with buffet cars, that again would help to eliminate foolish and unnecessary jaunts by civilians (yes, for the greater liberties I am willing to sacrifice for the time many smaller ones!). Last week on a journey from Glasgow to London my companions were four

Canadian soldiers and three corporals in the R.A.F. The journey took ten hours, and the Canadians had already been travelling two hours and a half, while one of the airmen had had ten hours in the train the previous night. Three of the Canadians and this particular airman had no food at all. Happily, a hospitable hostess had made ample provision for my own journey, so much so that it sustained the five of us until we reached Euston. But why cannot the "Forces" be issued with rations for journeys of this length? They are made to carry enough of equipment, in all conscience.

The most striking feature of travel with men in uniform (with the girls it is not so noticeable: they are more mindful of their appearance in public!) is their amazing capacity for sleep. For most of the journey just mentioned six of my fellow-passengers slept the sleep of the just. The Canadians showed not the slightest interest in the country through which we were passing—the Lowlands, Carlisle, the Lakeland Fells, Morecambe Bay, the three spires of Lichfield, Harrow-on-the-Hill. Is this sleepiness the effect of fresh air, and the strenuous training, or what?

In any case it is associated with what to me is the most disquieting feature of wartime travel—the fact that so few of one's young companions ever read a book. The newspapers are passed round and glanced at; occasionally a youth is immersed in a dirty dog's-eared threepenny thriller; on several occasions children's "comics" have been circulated and perused with interest. This afternoon *The Devil's Apprentice* did not keep our attractive artillery-man awake for more than five minutes. Last week I observed an omnibus volume of *The Saint* (no, dear denizen of the Senior Common Room, this is *not* an abridgment of Baring-Gould or about Little Gidding: "the Saint" is a likeable crook), but that has been the nearest approach to a *book* I have seen in the hands of a man in uniform for some time. Of course it may be that in the first-class carriages which journeying ministers do not frequent young officers, after reading *The Spectator* or *The New Statesman,* turn to *Ambassador to Moscow* or *A Berlin Diary,* but I doubt it. In the third-class carriages there is no sign of any interest in war strategy or the post-war world, and that is true of conversation as of reading. That the war should be over as soon as possible—that is agreed all around. Not that "careless talk" has ceased: if "Next of Kin" was shown to all serving men, some have forgotten it already; on Saturday two men from the same regiment foregathered in our carriage after leave, and there was a good deal of informing talk between them about their duties and their destination; one sailor boy lived up to the traditions of the silent service; the only time he spoke in three and a half hours was to ask to borrow the evening paper.

The ubiquitous, all-absorbing topic of conversation—it was the same in the B.E.F. in France in January, 1940—is *Leave,* its length, its allowance or otherwise of travelling time, what can be done with 48 hours, the dirty dogs who don't return from embarkation leave on time, so that other men are sent abroad in their places *without having had leave,* and so on, and so on. This fact is perhaps as encouraging as the absence of reading and intellectual interests is disturbing; the place that home and civilian life have in the thoughts of all, the eager anticipation of relief from routine for a few hours, the love of being free men again, and their desire to get back to these things when their stern job is done—here I see hope for the future. There is never the slightest suggestion of any attempt to shirk the job, any more than there is the slightest pretence of liking it; but there is always the assumption, an assumption which is indeed a conviction, that the war is a temporary phase, and that when it is over real life will be resumed,

with love and home and individual freedom. And to be assured that this conviction lies deep beneath all war's upheaval, and behind those slumbering faces, is a sufficient compensation for all the discomforts of wartime travel.

* * *

On returning from St. Petersburg—was it in 1874?—Dean Stanley once thrilled his Abbey congregation by an account of his journey and the Royal event in which he had shared. He concluded by saying that he had learnt two things from his experience — the inestimable advantages of foreign travel, and that "there's no place like home". A journeying preacher after many months of travel can agree with the first, but the second he cordially acclaims as he heaves a glad sigh of relief on noticing from his diary that his next six Sundays find him in London pulpits, with no need to indulge in the delights of train journeys in wartime.

ALBERT PEEL.

NOT BEFORE TIME

When the sun-rise opens children's eyes, sleep-laden,
Quick feet to the window, softly padding, hasten,
Eager faces, hearts expectant, tiptoe-lifted,
Peering stealthy through the curtain, cranny-rifted,
To surprise the morning-glory at its dawning.
Diamond-dewy grasses glitter: red, a-yawning,
The bedded roses rouse and waken, and the tall trees
Swaying stir from slumber each its nursling may-breeze.

O the rapture of the glory of the garden!
But for child, too early risen, by the falling,
Still night-blinded, stairway only is there faring
Whither eager heart would lead him: must, scarce-daring,
Through the silent house adventure, shadow-haunted,
Must go creeping, hurrying, running, panic-daunted,
Beat upon the prisoned door: comes girl or boy,
Only so, to morning joy.

So, in old age, is there waking from our earth-bound
Sleep, forgetting whence and whither, while the day-round,
Slow, procession of the hours, getting, spending,
Uncontented journeys nearby to its ending.
Lonely-dwelling, someone's spirit, silence-shrouded,
Through illusion's riven veil may see, unclouded,
Light not earthly; through some unforbidden gateway
Seek, before time, waking into long lost Noonday.

There's no going but through darkness to the sunlight.
Dread we, yet and long for, the waking from our earth-night.
But the old, in some attended last grey day-break,
Wondering see Azrael the angel, Death's kind name-sake—
Veiled and hooded, is he smiling?—at their bedside,
Rise and follow, unaffrighted, him their home-guide;
Not as children fear the darkness: for the years,
Growing old, outlive their fears.

H. B. SHEPHEARD.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS

It is possible that the Churches today are an anachronism. No state organized on the principles of the synthesis could allow dogmatic religious teaching in the state schools, and it is highly improbable that students who had received an objective teaching in ethics and philosophy would be attracted to the Churches. Community centres, centres of adult education, and societies formed on the basis of common creative interests, will tend in the future to provide the fellowship which people have found in the past in the Churches. Vigorous minds today recognize that the Churches are out-of-date survivals. As Dean Inge has often pointed out, the Churches no longer attract men of robust character and intellect.

J. B. Coates, *A Common Faith or Synthesis.*

As for Englishmen, or, to give less offence, Britons—surely everyone knows that such a breed simply does not exist. For whatever you may say about them is both true and untrue—which only proves that they cannot possibly be real. The British are greedy shopkeepers, but also gentlemen; they are hypocrites, but deeply religious; they are the most unintellectual people in Europe, yet have produced the finest literature in the world; they are cold and unemotional, but very sentimental; they are known all the world over as the subtlest political schemers, yet are really simple-minded and honest; they are individualists, yet no other nation lives more by convention; they live for nothing but sport, but practically all the sports' records are in the hands of foreigners; they are ruled by a small clique of aristocrats and financiers, yet theirs is the oldest and truest democracy in the world; they are effete and degenerate, yet after 1939 every freedom-loving country looked up to their courage and their undaunted fighting spirit. The reality of the British is evidently of some super-dimensional quality that defies all efforts at describing what is common to them all.

Rom Landau, *The Fool's Progress.*

About the people of Germany, stolid yet volatile, in Europe and yet not wholly of it, the West has been too long deceived. First we were told that, after 1919, having turned their back on their past, they never could stomach a creature such as Hitler. Then it was said that, since he must be sobered down by responsibilities of office, all would be well. And after that came the series of reports, conveyed by suave Nazi agents and foreign amateurs of high and low degree, describing the Germans as pacific at heart —Hitler himself being in this regard, in a phrase then popular, "perfectly sincere". They broke treaties, it later had to be added, only to regain their self-respect; but that they did this by riding roughshod over the self-respect of others passed largely unnoticed. From the start, furthermore, there were knowing murmurs about "better elements" inside and outside the Party whose hands must not be tied. And when the war did come we were informed finally that it was not the German people but the Nazi regime that was being fought. Is this cup of poison not yet full to the brim? Have there not been enough failures on mission, official and unofficial, whose bland assurances in nominal loyalty were more noxious than calculated treason? And from their ignominy let the rational lesson be deduced by men of all parties and of none. Before another general peace settlement is framed, before an ampler world order can be contrived, the particular problem of the place of Germany in that world order will have to be faced and decided.

Lionel Gelber, *Peace by Power.*

CURRENT LITERATURE

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

Jesus Christ The Same. By JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., D.Litt. Hodder. 6s.

Much water has passed under the bridge since Dr. James Moffatt wrote *The Historical New Testament*, and many and profound have been the contributions he has made to biblical learning. But in the veteran's writings there are the same characteristic features—a deep and abiding faith in Christ, a respect for all true learning, and a belief in the historical method. All these mark these Shaffer Lectures delivered at Yale Divinity School, which consider "some of the relevant evidence for the divine humanity of our Lord in historical perspective".

> The attempt is to indicate afresh, in the light of our newer knowledge, how nothing is more probable than that he who lived on earth for a few years was the same Christ whom his followers worshipped as Lord, that no new Jesus was created by any syncretistic movement in the first Christian century, that there is a unity in the unsolved mystery of his person which is not only real but the real cause underlying the various interpretations of his life and work, and that later experiences of the Church repeatedly imply a continuity of communion with him which is deeper than any inner or outer change of the faith. In other words, by criticizing criticism as well as tradition, we are on the way to a definite, constructive conviction that in a deep sense Jesus Christ is the same for us as he has ever been for our predecessors, little as we may be able to use some of their precise language about him, and also that there is no other Jesus visible or possible on the horizon of a faith which can be seriously called Christian. But in order to recognize how the data converge upon this conclusion, it is imperative that the study of historical perspective be taken honestly and thoroughly.

This thesis is worked out "honestly and thoroughly", with abundant illustration drawn from Dr. Moffatt's omnivorous reading. There are unforgettable sentences too:

> Some prayer folk would do better to pray less and think more: it would be well for them and for their fellows if they would open their minds to receive fresh messages from God as well as open their lips in order to speak to him.
>
> Criticism is not questioning but judgment, and learning may abound where judgment is scant.

From these lectures readers will receive much stimulus, and preachers will be dull indeed if they do not suggest many a sermon.

Invitation to Pilgrimage. By JOHN BAILLIE, D.Litt., D.D. Oxford Press. 5s.

This is a great little book which every apologist for the Christian faith ought to read. Prof. Baillie is concerned about the number of thinking men

who have ceased to believe in Christianity, and he invites them to join him as he guides them on the journey back. He is a good guide, sure of his direction, having mastered his maps; and he is a pleasant guide, sweetly reasonable, never dictatorial, and able to point out the beauties of the scene as the company journeys along. We wish those whom he has specially in mind would read his pages; they would never be irritated by arrogance or intolerance, and they would, we believe, find his arguments convincing, though we imagine some would find Ch. 10, "How We May Be Put Right", a stumbling-block. Once over that, they would probably follow without difficulty to the end.

At two points we ourselves had hesitations. Last quarter we noted how Dr. Buttrick assumed that when Jesus promised to be with two or three gathered in His name, He meant two or three hundred. Prof. Baillie goes a step farther: it does not mean, he says, that Jesus is more likely to be with small gatherings than with large, but with a community, however small, rather than with an individual; "What Christ would say is not 'only two or three' but 'at least two or three' ". This Presbyterian habit of improving on the words of Jesus must be watched! Of course Jesus can be present with a large company as with a small, but are there not dangers in saying He is more likely to be with a group than with an individual, and altering His words to suit our interpretations?

Our second hesitation was in the chapter "Journey's End", where Dr. Baillie discusses personal immortality. He writes—and the words are an excellent illustration of the clarity of his style:

> You cannot be a Christian in your ethic without being a Christian also in your eschatology. You are unlikely in the long run to remain staunchly Christian in your conduct of the present life, if you refuse the Christian hope of life eternal. Every one of the substitute views involves the disparagement of the individual soul. . . . Either the individual counts or he does not. If we think it right that he should not count for God, are we likely to go on believing that he should count for his fellow mortals?

This kind of argument always seems to us as an attempt to impose our human categories of individuality and personality upon God as if they were ultimate. God may have better things for us than our eyes have seen and our minds reasoned. We must and we do, for ourselves, recognize the indefeasible value of the individual human soul, but God may conserve those values in a way we know not. Surely the right way is to commit all our way unto God, in the spirit of the words Dr. Baillie himself quotes:

> I know not where His islands lift
> Their fronded palms in air,
> I only know I cannot drift
> Beyond His love and care.

It is not enough to brush aside "substitute views" with "vague quasi-Buddhist doctrine of 're-absorption' ". It is the *N.T.* which records: "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me", and those words can be related to life after death as to life here. Dr. Baillie himself, in the chapter, "Invitation to Church", shows how the individual best realizes himself when he "belongs to something":

> The age of rationalistic individualism is now for the most part behind us, and men are seeking new forms of solidarity in their social life. In one part of the world after another there emerges the spectacle

> of men yielding up their individual liberty, including their liberty of thought, with apparent relief, gladly sinking their lives in the corporate life of this or that party or totalitarian movement.

In gladly sinking our lives in God, saying "Not my will, but Thine, be done", we may reach our highest selves, and not in craving for an individual survival restricted by such conceptions of personality as we now have.

Prof. Baillie says in another place:

> God has apparently done everything He possibly could, short of exercising actual compulsion upon our wills, to prevent us from making our religion a private luxury—and yet we still try to make it a private luxury!

Certainly we appear to do so in our demand for personal survival!

These two caveats must not detract from our appreciation of the book, admirable as it is in form and content. It is full of good things, from the chapter "Why We Cannot Put Ourselves Right" to the gentle inquiry what the prophets would reply to the statement that Israel was spiritually minded, with "a genius for religion"! And there are some apt touches of humour—the little wireless fan at church for the first time, who "liked the music better than the news"; the sentence from an autobiography (1930), "I have never lost the childlike humility which characterizes all truly great men"; the Sunday School teacher concluding a lesson on the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican with the words, "And now, children, let us thank God that we are not as this Pharisee"; and Joseph Parker's retort to the business magnate's boast, "I'm a self-made man, you know"—"Sir, you have lifted a great load of responsibility from the Almighty".

EDITOR.

A History of the Expansion of Christianity. Vol. IV. The Great Century, 1800—1914: Europe and the United States of America, By K. S. LATOURETTE. Eyre & Spottiswoode. 25s.

With Vol. IV of this indispensable work Prof. Latourette has to work on a larger canvas; here he deals with Europe and the United States, leaving the rest of the world to two other volumes. And this leads to our only criticism of a splendid contribution to learning: a loss of proportion in dealing with the United States. Granted that the frontiers of the United States were extending for most of the period, and that thus geographical expansion was continued, this does not justify the dismissal of "home missions" in Britain, with all their ramifications, in a short paragraph (p. 144): all manner of institutions and organizations on the other side of the Atlantic get more space than that at a later stage. This bias is reflected in the bibliography, which has some strange omissions. There are slips or misprints on pp. 157, 168, and 209, and sometimes Prof. Latourette assumes knowledge in his readers that they do not possess: we ought, of course, to be familiar with the "Know Nothing Movement", but we are not.

This having been said, it must be recorded that the volume gathers together a mass of facts nowhere else obtainable in such space, and there can be few students who will not learn much from it. Especially should British scholars read the American chapters; about the Indians, the Negroes, and the frontier missions of both Roman Catholics and Protestants, there is a fascinating story. Prof. Latourette's comments and conclusions, based on his immense knowledge, are of great value. We pass on two of them to the consideration of our readers:

> Compared with the total population of the country and with the membership of Protestant churches, relatively few [Roman converts]

were made. The Roman Catholic Church in the United States had its phenomenal growth primarily through its success in retaining its hold on immigrants already of its faith and through the high birth rate among its adherents.

In the British Islands Congregationalism was Nonconformist, in opposition to the established churches and largely from the urban middle class. In New England it long enjoyed the position of the Standing Order akin to that of a state church. It acquired, therefore, the attitude of a dominant church and tended to draw more extensively from the so-called "better families". Moreover, in the United States it was more aggressive, less on the defensive, and was the source of more new movements, social and religious, than in Great Britain.

EDITOR.

Retrospect of an Unimportant Life. By HERBERT HENSLEY HENSON. Vol. I. 1863-1920. Oxford Press. 16s.

H. R. L. Sheppard: Life and Letters. By R. ELLIS ROBERTS. Murray. 15s.

These two volumes illustrate in themselves the comprehensive nature of the Anglican Church. Though both Bishop Hensley Henson and Dick Sheppard at times kicked against the pricks and talked of having to leave the Church, they remained to enliven, if not to adorn, as well as to exemplify its growth in wisdom since it excluded John Wesley.

Dr. Hensley Henson draws largely on his Journal in this first volume, which ends with his nomination to the See of Durham. His unusual ability was first seen when, a boy from a private school and a non-collegiate student, he took a First in the History Schools and was elected a Fellow of All Souls. Head of Oxford House, Vicar of Barking, Chaplain of Ilford Hospital, Canon of Westminster, Dean of Durham, Bishop of Hereford, and finally Bishop of Durham—in this record there appears no indication of the fact that Dr. Henson often took his own, and an unpopular, line, and was a continual source of anxiety to the Archbishops. "I am not the man to yield or to be ignored", he wrote in his Journal in 1920; so his photographs suggest, and so his narrative bears out. A preacher perhaps first of all, Dr. Henson believed in the liberty of prophesying, and he has fought valiantly against the rigid interpretation of the Creeds and for the right of those who could not accept orthodox and conventional views not only to remain in the Church but to declare their convictions. He has, of course, been anathema to the Anglo-Catholics, who came to fear him though not to love him. He often "stuck his neck out", as the Americans say, but it resisted all the blows it received; the violence of his language—words like "disgust" and "loathe" are common—display that "truculence" to which he admits more than once, and which was responsible for some of his troubles.

His early views of Nonconformists are revealing, for he accepted the notions of some Anglican circles about their ignorance, vulgarity, and bigotry; that he came to be a protagonist in the fight for better relations with them, and preached in Digbeth Institute and the City Temple despite opposition, is a tribute to his character and a mark of the progress that has been made.

Mention by Dr. Henson of his stay with Williston Walker for the Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale revived an old memory. When we were dining with Walker in 1920 he remarked:

In 1909 a remarkable prophecy was made in this room by an Englishman. He was sitting in your chair, and we were discussing the

> international situation. He was so worked up that he rose and began to walk up and down the room. He said there was going to be war in Europe between England and Germany, that it would break out in 1912 and be a long war, and its result would be determined by America coming in. He was right in every particular but the date. It was Canon Henson of Westminster.

We look forward to the second volume of this stormy petrel's retrospect.

We do not agree with those who call Mr. Roberts's a dull book: Dick Sheppard was so alive that a book about him which succeeded in being dull would be a *tour-de-force* indeed. We did find it irritating: the analysis of Sheppard into Lawrie and Dick became very tiring, and then we received the impression that the author was making the utmost of what was after all but a brief personal acquaintance with his subject. Mr. Roberts would, we believe, have written a better book had he not known Sheppard at all, and in it there would have been less about Mr. Roberts, whose opinions of Church dignitaries and opinions about Dissenters have their place, but not in a biography. The book has a tragic story to tell—of domestic unhappiness and of constant struggle against illness. We cannot bring ourselves to sympathize with Sheppard in his financial difficulties. He had a good stipend, a legacy of £20,000, and we are told he could get twenty or thirty guineas each for his articles: he had no need therefore to have monetary worries.

Dick Sheppard was a man whose heart and head were often in conflict, and the heart often won. He was a man of abounding energy, with a great love of humanity—it would perhaps be better to say of men and women—and a genius for friendship. He never spared himself, and he had his reward in the affection of thousands of people. Perhaps those at home had to pay part of the price for his public service; perhaps he would have lived longer and done more if he had exercised more restraint. He preferred to burn out rather than rust out, and it is hard to blame him. It is not hard to blame Mr. Roberts: could anybody, even if he tried, write anything more false to history, and more unjust, than these sentences?:

> Take, for instance, Dick's desire to break bread and drink wine with those who, by their own action, assert that it is not seemly to eat with Catholic Christians at the Table of the Lord. How else can they explain their defence of their ancestors' separation, or their own continuance in it?

It was Nonconformists, of course, who passed the Acts of Uniformity! Mr. Roberts's Nonconformist background should not allow him to be ignorant of the fact that *all* Christians are invited to the Lord's Table in most Free Churches: today Mr. Roberts would be welcome at the church we attend, while we should be rebuffed at the Lord's Table in the church of his choice. EDITOR.

The History of the Primitive Church. By JULES LEBRETON and JACQUES ZEILLER. Burns, Oates. Vol. I. 16s.

This translated work is the first of two volumes dealing with the subject, and treats of the Church in the *N.T.* It is also the first of a series of 24 volumes intended to cover the whole history of the Church, written by specialists on each period and considering not only the external but also the internal activity of "Catholicism". This is a noteworthy aspiration on the part of French scholars at the present time; unfortunately the volume gives us no date as to its composition, though references to other books

make it subsequent to 1936. We can only hope that despite the current difficulties it will be found possible to make progress with the scheme.

It cannot be said that the volume in hand is particularly distinctive. There is the usual introductory matter discussing the Roman World and the World of Jewry (Palestinian and Diasporic) at the beginning of the Christian era, and this is followed by chapters on the life and teaching of Jesus, the apostolic preaching and the beginnings of the Church, the Pauline mission, Peter and the beginnings of the Roman Church, James (and Jerusalem), and John (and Asia). These chapters with one exception are a paraphrase of *N.T.* writings and history. The exception of course is that which deals with Peter, where the authors stand stoutly by the Roman tradition (with some modification) and dismiss the notable work of Heussi (*War Petrus in Rom?*) as "categorical rather than convincing in its negations".

The literary problem of *Hebrews* "is of only secondary importance", but it reveals to us the thought of Paul. Both the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel are the work of the son of Zebedee. The Pastorals are Pauline.

Over against these conservative positions it is both fair and pleasant to note that the authors are catholic in the true sense in their references to works by those not of their own communion, both English and German, and in their bibliography. They do not seem to be aware of Dr. Dodd's work on the Apostolic Preaching. There is no index.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Nature of Catholicity. By DANIEL T. JENKINS, M.A., B.D. Faber & Faber. 5s.

In this book Mr. Jenkins stands up in defence of Dogmatic Theology in opposition to the common English mentality which undervalues it and spends itself either on Biblical criticism or on matters of Church order: Biblical criticism is only a preamble to Dogmatics, while Church order when rightly understood as the ordinance of God depends on Dogmatics. The Church and its order are determined for what they truly are, when they are properly based on the Gospel. The Church exists to proclaim the Gospel; and its ministry, its liturgy, and its sacraments are all to be apprehended from this point of view.

Therefore, the fundamental question prior to all questions about Church order is that of the Gospel. What is the Gospel? Mr. Jenkins says that it is Jesus Christ as testified to by the Apostles, whose testimony we have in the New Testament: this testimony is rightly interpreted by the Chalcedonian definition of the One Person in Two Natures, according to which Jesus Christ is not "a man" but is "man" or universal humanity, so that he becomes the Second Adam and all that He is and does has significance for the whole of humanity.

The Gospel being thus defined, what work is left for Dogmatic Theology? Its duty is critical. It has continually to bring the Church under the judgment of the Word of God revealed in Jesus Christ and testified to in the Scriptures. The Liturgy of the Church has a similar office of judgment: its purpose is to bring the worshippers to repentance and reformation according to the Word of God.

In all the foregoing definition and explanation of the Gospel, of Dogmatic Theology and of the Liturgy, Mr. Jenkins takes his stand on the ground of the Reformation of the sixteenth century as renewed and developed in our time by Karl Barth. In opposition to the lineal notion of Apostolic succession in the ministry, safeguarded through the historic epis-

copate, our author maintains an apostolic succession constituted by the loyalty of the ministry (and the Church as a whole) to the testimony of the Apostles. It is the presence of Jesus Christ in the Church that constitutes it both Catholic and Apostolic. *Ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia.* Consequently, Mr. Jenkins defends the idea of the Independent Church. Every single church where Christ is thus present is independent, depending on nothing but the Word of God; and is a particular embodiment of the whole Catholic Church, which is similarly independent with an independence of precisely the same character.

There is a great deal that is valuable in *The Nature of Catholicity*. Mr. Jenkins sees quite rightly the cardinal importance of a theological foundation and constitution of the Christian Church and its worship. He has a gift for theology, and he exhibits the advantage of having mastered and made himself at home in a definite theological system: this mastery gives a consistency to his book, enabling him to judge other views of Catholicism and churchmanship with precision and certainty. His trumpet gives no uncertain sound as he prepares himself for a battle in which he rains blows upon Roman Catholics, Anglo-Catholics, Fundamentalists, Anglican and Free Church Modernists, and everyone who does not fit in with the Barthian standard.

But these blows would be more effective if Mr. Jenkins's own standpoint were less vulnerable. The proverb says that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones: Mr. Jenkins's Barthianism is very vulnerable at some points.

(1) In his insistence on the "testimony of the Apostles" there is implied a devastating scepticism about the Jesus of history, to whom we are told we cannot in any case get back. If we cannot, what becomes of the Incarnation beyond a doctrine or a myth? Christianity is undoubtedly a historical religion, but a historical religion founded on a history that is ambiguous and uncertain is in parlous case.

(2) The Barthian conception of the "testimony of the Apostles" overlooks the very patent fact that this testimony has not only a dogmatic but also an apologetic aspect: it preaches Christ in the language and in terms of the thought of the First Century. To treat the Apostolic preaching as if it had been formed in a hermetically sealed chamber without contact with the *Zeitgeist* is unhistorical and altogether impossible.

(3) It is a bold step to identify the Christ of Apostolic testimony—to say nothing of the Jesus of history—with the Chalcedonian doctrine of the One Person in two natures, and especially with the idea that Jesus Christ was not an individual man. If He was not "a man", once more it must be said that there was no real Incarnation: all that we have is a Theophany, a Godhead "veiled in flesh". Besides, the theory that Jesus was not "a man" stands in direct opposition to the "Apostolic testimony", which it professes to interpret: cp. *Acts* 2^{22}; *Jn.* 1^{30}, 8^{40}—very remarkably these last two evidences are from the very Gospel which explicitly expounds the theology of the Incarnation.

(4) Mr. Jenkins thinks (and I cordially agree with him) that the divisions of the Christian Church are contrary to its proper nature. The same principle of existence—*ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia*—should not issue in the scandal of rival denominations. But Mr. Jenkins combines his assertion of the unity of the Church with an attack on democracy as a form of Church polity: he seems to leave it quite hazy and indefinite how the unity of the Church is to be assured in practice. If we are to wait till all Christians agree in their understanding of the "Word of God", we shall wait till the

Greek Kalends. Not even a single independent church can do without some practical method of maintaining its unity, which must be either monarchic, oligarchic, or democratic. Ritschl distinguished between the religious view of the Church according to which it is governed by God, and the ethical view according to which it is operated by men: we have to use human means and pray to God for guidance in their use. Dependence upon God does not mean that a human political method is excluded: there may be a dispute as to what polity best suits the genius of Christianity, but there is no warrant for rejecting democracy simply because it is human.

(5) Mr. Jenkins speaks too slightingly of others equally earnest with himself who belong to a different theological camp. I do not defend the thesis of Lenwood's book, *Jesus—Lord or Leader?*, but when Mr. Jenkins says that it is difficult "at this time of day" to understand his mentality, he exposes himself to the retort that it is difficult "at this time of day" to understand the mentality that is satisfied to be sceptical about the Jesus of history and to maintain that Jesus was not an individual man. Moreover, Mr. Jenkins should not allow himself to speak of the claim of Dr. Cadoux to represent Congregationalism as "preposterous". Dr. Cadoux does represent with great energy and great learning, though perhaps in an extreme form, one important type of Congregationalist thought, the liberal Evangelicalism which is by no means as dead as Mr. Jenkins thinks it is. It is a pity that so able a book as *The Nature of Catholicism* should be marred by personal attacks of so provocative a character.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England. By PHILIP HUGHES. Burns, Oates. 18s.

Its author would be the first to acknowledge that this volume is only a contribution to a highly involved subject, and is not definitive. It is, however, of importance for the unpublished material it presents, and for its notable attempt to be fair. It is divided into three unequal parts, in which the chief characters are, respectively, Pole, Allen, and Richard Smith. There is little originality of treatment in Part I; but in Part III, which is devoted almost entirely to the disputes between seculars and religious under the three archpriests and Bishops Bishop and Smith (1598-1631), much use is made of the archives of the Roman Congregation *De Propaganda Fide*. Considering the "hates of incredible strength" which abounded during this period, it is remarkable that Catholic piety did not perish in this country altogether.

In Part II, after an introductory chapter, in which Miss Garrett's thesis that the Protestant emigration under Mary was an "astute manœuvre" is accepted *in toto*, the headings are: "The Counter-action through Spirituals", "The Reply through the Temporal Arm", and "The Elizabethan Martyrs". It is part of Fr. Hughes's case thus sharply to divide the spiritual work of Allen's seminarists and of the Jesuits from Allen's and the Pope's encouragement of invasion. It is a fact that Allen kept his seminary work separate from his political machinations; but it is not a fact which Elizabeth's government could be expected to credit, especially after the seminarist Ballard and the Jesuit Persons were found implicated in plots and schemes for invasion. Morally, Fr. Hughes makes much of the extraordinary lack of co-ordination of information, through which the Popes were as ignorant of the Englishmen's plots as the Englishmen were of the Popes' plans for risings and invasions; but such ignorance, if it be granted, hardly suggests that they would not have supported one another, if they could. While not altogether neglecting the political priests, Fr.

Hughes pays special attention to those papally recognized as martyrs. What is needed is rather to analyse, so far as possible, the cases of *all* the Catholics put to death: those whose "cause", when submitted, was accepted (the official martyrs); at least one whose "cause" was postponed for fuller evidence (Matthew Harrison); and many others (*e.g.*, Ballard) whose "cause", for whatever reason, was not submitted. Until this is done, and the names are added of leaders who were imprisoned but escaped death, it is difficult to avoid a charge of *suppressio veri* in effect, if not in intention. J. Kretzschmar's *Die Invasionsprojekte der katholischen Mächte gegen England zur Zeit Elisabeths* is absent from the bibliographical note.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The Discipline of Peace. By K. E. BARLOW. Faber & Faber. 8s. 6d.

We won the last war but lost the peace. Can we win the peace if and when we win this war? That is the question with which this thoughtful and thought-provoking book attempts to deal. It is written by a medical doctor, who makes good use of his biological knowledge to explain man to himself as at once a political animal and organic to the natural world around him. He has much to say about the soil, its use and abuse, about plant and animal life, and the emergence of man. He concludes:

> As we pass from plant to animal and man we perceive that the characteristic discipline of each is elaborated upon and interwoven with the disciplines which have preceded it. Since the higher social and political activities of man are a further elaboration of the disciplinary processes to which attention is here drawn, it is clear that an understanding of these processes is of immediate relevance to our enquiry about man, his future, his philosophy, and the way in which he can provide within his society the conditions of peace.

Dr. Barlow then goes on to illustrate his point by discussing the problem of soil erosion, which has a very definite bearing on man's relation to nature. Then comes a chapter on Causation, Genetics, and Evolution, in which the determinist-materialist position is very effectively dealt with, and the book concludes with two fascinating chapters on Science and its limitations and the machine and its dangers. The conclusion of the whole matter is this. Science has given man great power:

> The question that faces us today is whether man's power is still to be used arrogantly, without giving a damn for God or man, or whether, on the other hand, man is to admit that he forms a unit in a system of nature, an organization to which he owes allegiance.

Dr. Barlow writes well and makes his general position quite clear. But it must be confessed that for the non-scientific reader his book is hard going.

W. B. SELBIE.

The Starlit Dome. By G. WILSON KNIGHT. Oxford Press. 16s.

Normal conceptual thinking is related to the poetry it criticizes "in somewhat the same way as the science of Christian theology corresponds, or should correspond, to the New Testament". With such a dynamic ideal of criticism Professor Wilson Knight here continues his studies of the English poets. Those who are familiar with his earlier essays will find the same organic interpretation of imagery, the same attempt to elucidate the unique angle of vision of each poet, applied here to the four "romantics" —Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Keats. This approach to poetry, suspended as it were between criticism and a new creation, is not for the casual reader, who may be forgiven for supposing that Professor Knight's

theories tend on occasion to hold more than the facts warrant. The most valuable section in this book, decidedly, is the analysis of the fundamental significance of Coleridge's "Divine Comedy" — *Christabel, Ancient Mariner, Kubla Khan.* Professor Knight's criticism cuts deeper than the more purely technical analysis of Professor Lowe's. The two approaches supplement and illumine, rather than overlap one another. It is at least certain that the initiated reader of Professor Knight will be unable to resist turning once again, and with a richer apprehension, to the poems themselves.

P. A. SPALDING.

The Gospel and India's Heritage. By A. J. APPASAMY, M.A., D.Phil. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

We have already reviewed in these columns Dr. Appasamy's earlier books, *Christianity as Bhakti Marga* and *The Johannine Doctrine of Life,* and we warmly welcome this more elaborate work which seeks to relate a Johannine interpretation of Christianity to the aspirations of Hindu *bhakti.*

It is a thankless task to attempt from the Christian standpoint a comparative study of Christianity and a non-Christian religion. The claim that Christianity has unique and final value is offensive not only to Hindus but to those Western students of religion who speak as if no one should write on religion who has had any vital experience of it. On the other hand, to write with courtesy and appreciation of the higher elements of Hinduism seems to some Christians treachery to Christianity—in Karl Barth's ugly phrase it is "to howl with the wolves". Doubtless Dr. Appasamy will be attacked from both sides as all are who, confessing the full Christian faith, seek to recognize truth and goodness wherever they are found.

There are dangers in the translation of the ideas of one religion into the terminology of another, and these dangers Dr. Appasamy does not always escape. Thus the "non-resistance" enjoined in the Sermon on the Mount cannot be identified with Mr. Gandhi's political expedient of "non-violence". In present circumstances anything that an English reviewer writes on Mr. Gandhi will be dismissed by some as "British prejudice". Instead of making any comment, we would commend to Dr. Appasamy's consideration Brunner's judgment on Mr. Gandhi's movement for Civil Disobedience written long before the present war:

> It is pure fanaticism to think that the political method of "passive resistance" has any connexion with the commands of the Sermon on the Mount. Passive resistance is a political coercive method, just as much as the actual use of force; it is even an extremely refined and subtle method of coercion, since, if it is adopted by a private individual against the authority in power, it offers the latter the choice of either renouncing the effort to impose its will, or of making use of the method of force. Thus to the extent in which it virtually consists in holding up all the central authorities to moral contempt, this policy is extremely and subtly immoral, and its glorification by pacifists is a sign of ethical confusion in their thinking.

This book has been written at the request of the National Christian Council in India "with a view to translation into the chief Indian languages". We hope that in this country also it will be widely read and studied. The Indian Church needs much those who can present Christianity in an idiom which educated Indians can understand, and we trust that this book will win the influence which it deserves.

SYDNEY CAVE.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

The Rev. Geoffrey Allen's **Law with Liberty* (S.C.M., 5s.) is only a small book, but it makes a very important contribution to the understanding of our times. It has the advantage of expounding a general principle which finds expression in all parts of human life—in the individual and in society, in organization political and economic, in the State and in the Church, in God and man. Mr. Allen argues that there are three stages of development: the *thesis* is authority, with individual subservience and the danger of repression of individual liberty and initiative; disillusionment comes with the discovery of the fallibility of authority; the *antithesis* is therefore revolt into independence, the quest for individual liberty, and the danger of a self-seeking individualism; a second disillusionment comes with the discovery of the fallibility of the self; and the *synthesis* in a free fellowship, with free assent to authority and a balance between centralized organization and individual initiative. The theme is carefully developed, with apt illustration from Mr. Allen's experience in China, and the book is well worth study. A remarkable phenomenon in the shape of "a vertical horizontal line" appears on p. 51.

A life-time ago Dr. William Adams Brown eased the way for many students by his *Christian Theology in Outline;* since then men in all the Churches have been continually in his debt, and it was fitting that he, a Presbyterian from America, should be invited to the enthronement of the Archbishop of Canterbury. His little book, **A Creed for Free Men* (S.C.M., 5s.), he calls "A Study in Loyalties", and it will well repay reading. Even dictators, he says, have been forced into the business of creed-making, using power to introduce into the social chaos the order science and the Church have failed to achieve. What has democracy lacked, and where shall it find the way to harmonize liberty and law—in industry, in education, in religion? The titles of the succeeding chapters suggest the argument: How the Christian's faith reinforces the democrat's loyalty; The Democrat's Creed tested by life; What the Church alone can supply. Dr. Brown will not always carry the reader along with him—we ourselves failed to see the connection between the pages on symbols and the excellent list of "Truths to which these symbols witness"; but always he combines the open mind, the tolerant outlook, and the earnest spirit.

The indefatigable Dr. Walter Lowrie, to whom English-speaking scholars are indebted for so much work on Kierkegaard, continues his tremendous task in the translation of *The Sickness unto Death* (Oxford Press, 14s.), written in 1848. That Kierkegaard is far from easy we all know; some of the headings in Part I, "The Sickness unto Death is Despair", do not encourage the reader to think this work is simpler than others: thus we have "The Despair of Infinitude is due to the lack of Finitude"; "The Despair of Finitude is due to the lack of Infinitude"; "The Despair of Possibility is due to the lack of Necessity"; "The Despair of Necessity is due to the lack of Possibility". As a matter of discipline he will not be deterred, but we can imagine his relief when he ends this Part, relief soon to turn to consternation as he reads the beginning of the Second Part, "Despair is Sin":

> Sin is this: *before God, or with the conception of God, to be in despair at not willing to be oneself, or in despair at willing to be oneself.* Thus sin is potentiated weakness or potentiated defiance; sin is the potentiation of despair.

It needed all Dr. Lowrie's learning and enthusiasm to get us through; whether the result was worth the effort involved we are still in doubt.

Dr. G. W. Broomfield's *Revelation and Disunion* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d. & 4s.) is one of those books which make one sick at heart. Called "A Response to Tambaram", and claimed to be written in a new spirit, with the "Younger Churches" especially in mind, it is the old story served up anew. There is to be room for variation in the United Church—but only after everybody has accepted those things Dr. Broomfield deems essential. This is clear after much verbiage—instead of "I do think that" we have "I do not think there is reason to suppose that"; even to ask an episcopal Church for the recognition of ministers not episcopally ordained "is to ask for the surrender of that which it values most in its corporate spiritual life". How can Dr. Broomfield say that baptism is essential for membership of the Church when he must know many faithful disciples of Christ who have not been baptized with water? He assumes, of course, the dominical institution of the sacraments, and that we know the exact words of Jesus, speaking of matters "regulated by express and unmistakable commands during the Incarnation"—never suggesting scholars have doubts on the subject. Let it be understood at once that any attempt at union on these lines would merely cause new divisions—these attempts to unchurch the Friends always make us wish for a way to unbaptize ourselves at once!

It is heartening to meet a book written with the passion, the informed passion, of Mr. John Armitage's *Christian England* (Longmans, 5s.). Mr. Armitage is a prophet for today, concerned about the waste of human lives in a system where men put house to house and field to field:

> Man in these modern industries is given every consideration as a cog in the machine. He is kept well oiled. As a spiritual being he is ignored. The light industries claim the right to employ juveniles and women for as long as it is profitable for them to do so. It is no concern of theirs, they believe, what happens to the juvenile after the blind alley occupation; it is no concern of theirs that their girls make poor wives.

To all social problems, such as employment, Mr. Armitage applies the Christian test. Does society here regard or disregard the value of individual life, the rights of individual personality? He finds himself greatly encouraged by the *Christian News-Letter,* the Malvern Conference, the Sword of the Spirit Movement, and *The Times'* letter of the Church leaders; and he outlines a programme of Christian research.

In all the Churches there are stirrings in the tops of the trees, and not least in the Church of England, to which the authors of *The Day is at Hand* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.), Mr. Alec Boggis and the Rev. Kenneth Budd, belong. This correspondence reveals a concern for the Church which demands "a second Reformation", a "Christian revolution". The layman even goes so far as to suggest that groups of Christians should appoint one of their number to administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper when a priest is not available, and both demand much greater reality in the work and worship of the Church.

The Baptist Missionary Society this year celebrates its 150th Anniversary. For it Dr. F. Townley Lord has written a competent "short history", *Achievement* (Carey Press, 2s. 6d.). Smaller books deal with different fields, the Congo and India. With these can be read the L.M.S. pamphlets (4d.), *The New Advance,* by the Rev. A. M. Chirgwin, and *Before the Start,* by a Baptist, the Rev. E. A. Payne: can anyone conceive of a B.M.S. commemoration pamphlet written by a Congregationalist or anybody but a Baptist?

Miss Joan Bayldon has written a restrained and therefore all the more welcome account of a great evangelical churchman. *Cyril Bardsley, Evangelist* (S.P.C.K., 9s.) describes the work of a parish priest with great pastoral gifts, who became Secretary of the C.M.S., and then Bishop of Peterborough and of the new Diocese of Leicester. It was perhaps a pity that Bardsley had to spend so much time in administration and in money-raising, for this prevented the full use of some of his talents. He was an attractive character, and his attraction, like his earnestness, appears in these pages.

Congregationalism has included many types within its ranks, men distinguished in many spheres. John Oxenham was a loyal Congregationalist all his days, and we can legitimately take pride in the service of his pen to the cause of true religion. As novelist, as poet, and as writer on religious subjects, he had a world-wide influence, and his works do follow him. *"J.O."* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) is the story of his life told by his daughter Erica. We learn that the only time he wrote about his early days was in our own pages; to those days and to travels a large part of the present book is given. Many will rejoice in the long extracts from the travel letters; personally we could have spared some of them for fascinating chapters such as that on "Literary Work" and for more of the verse jottings, of which this is one:

Help me to make this day
Worthy of Thy giving
That the world may be
The better for my living.

The volume will be welcomed by many readers. We do not know whether the Oxenham family has a coat of arms; if not, we suggest four exclamation marks, a pen *rampant*, and a dog *couchant*.

Time after time we have heard American citizens say, "I loathe Roosevelt's home policy, his 'New Deal', just as much as I support his foreign policy". There is not much about the President's home policy, his pump-priming, his "buying time to think" in Mr. Basil Woon's *Roosevelt: World Statesman* (Davies, 10s. 6d.), a book which combines rather indiscriminate eulogy with a good deal of personal irrelevance. We are glad to see justice done to Mrs. Roosevelt, who has made a place for herself in her own right. The biography of the President has still to be written; it will recognize his personal courage, exemplified best in his victory over disease; his power of appeal, shown in his radio conquests; and his uncanny sense of timing, revealed again and again during the last three years. Mr. Woon sometimes lets his own shadow obscure the features of the man he is painting, to the detriment of his work.

Mr. David M. Cole's *Josef Stalin* (Rich & Cowan, 6s.) is a workmanlike biography of one of the most mysterious figures of our time. The Russian achievement in the last generation is a remarkable one, and only time will show whether Lenin or Stalin deserves most credit for it. If Mr. Cole has no good word for Trotsky, he is not blind to the darker sides of Stalin's character and policy, but he reveals a man of determination—"man of steel" well describes him—with much greater ability, both as statesman and soldier, than is generally conceded. Stalin has the power to wait—and then to strike; he sees what is possible and is essentially practical. These traits explain much of Russia's history in the last twenty years, and are not without encouragement to Russia's allies in the year 1942. Something has gone wrong with "Pushkin" on p. 15, and p. 85, l. 5 needs attention.

"You can't run an Empire on gallantry"; "It must be many years since British troops had to *withdraw* from anywhere". Sentences such as these, relating to the Gallipoli campaign, force their attention upon us today as we read John Presland's *Deedes Bey* (Macmillan, 16s.). The book has many good qualities, but it could easily have been better; a good many platitudes could have been omitted, and room found to bring Sir Wyndham Deedes's story down to the present day, with an account of the many-sided social work he has done in England since 1923. To write the life of a living person is far from easy, but there is sufficient variety here to make an interesting story: war in South Africa; training Turkish gendarmerie in N. Africa in towns whose names are much more familiar than they were two years ago; the Near East; Gallipoli; coadjutor of T. E. Lawrence; administrator in Egypt and Palestine—and then, like Lawrence, seeking comparative obscurity. Yet at the end we scarcely know the man: we have learnt he is a bachelor, a linguist, a passionate believer in justice between man and man and nation and nation, and apparently a believer in the Kingdom of God. But about all these we are left with questions to ask, and they are not answered in the vague concluding paragraphs.

And the Floods Came (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 15s.) contains all the characteristics of the long list of books to Mr. Arnold Lunn's name—the confidence of the convert, the aptness of the debater, snobbishness, and the power to interest which makes the reader go on reading no matter how much he may feel annoyed. Some of the chapters deal with England, Ireland, and Ulster in the early months of the war, but most of the book is given to a seven-months lecture trip in the United States. Mr. Lunn's description of the American attitude to the war is borne out in our own experience, though his contacts were in the main Roman Catholic. There is a revealing interview with Father Coughlin, now in eclipse, and some graphic accounts of experiences on land and sea. An interesting, if expensive, book.

12s. 6d., too, is a lot to pay for the 220 pages of Mr. Howard Spring's *In the Meantime* (Constable), which he himself calls "a jumble of random thoughts and happenings", in which "I shall be as garrulous and discursive as I please". Nevertheless, we are glad to have it for its account of journalism in Bradford, Manchester (C. P. Scott for once appears unfavourably—a fine editor without human relationships with those who served him), and London. Our previous acquaintance with Mr. Spring was limited to the sob-stuff movie, *My Son, My Son!* seen in New York, and an occasional review. Now we are inclined to read his novels. The book contains interesting gossip and some very useful advice to young writers. It has also some sound criticism of *Ulysses* and of many of the "moderns"; it is no defence, says Mr. Spring, to call writing "experimental":

> I do not see why, in painting and writing, any more than in science, experiment should be published with the *éclat* of achievement.

A Cornish Childhood (Cape, 12s. 6d.) is the autobiography of Mr. A. L. Rowse, recounting his story until he wins an Open Scholarship at Christ Church and Oxford becomes the dominant influence in his life. Mr. Rowse has already proved his mettle as scholar by becoming a Fellow of All Souls, and especially by his *Tudor Cornwall,* and he has shown his political sympathies by standing as Labour candidate. Nevertheless, there is much in these pages to show that as yet he lacks both some of the qualifications of the scholar and real sympathy and appreciation for the people from whom he has sprung. The scholar does not need to describe things with which he disagrees—and Mr. Rowse disagrees violently—as "deplorable" and

"nauseating", nor is "loathe" his favourite verb. Prejudices are everywhere—"the unreadable Emerson"; "the type that is dominant in the county—conventional, narrow, nonconformist, hypocritical, uncivilized . . . that loathsome sterile mentality"; "that horrible smug self-satisfaction which is about all that is left of nonconformity". The proletariat whose suffrages he seeks he seems to regard as entirely unintelligent; the informed, politically alive artisan once so common in the North of England and, we suspect, in Cornwall too, is never mentioned.

Psychologists will find abundant material in the story of this poor boy who made good, the boy who was different, determined to speak English when all others spoke Cornish, fighting against ill-health, moods, and lack of parental interest, and often frustrated and rebellious. Mr. Rowse is rightly proud of winning his way to Oxford, and of his literary achievements, but many readers would be able to discern most of his background from the mental attitude and processes revealed in these pages. We look forward with eagerness to the Oxford chapter in the writer's life. Mr. Rowse, so boastful of his conquest of French, should really not write *"bête noir"*, and the list of French writers he gives, with Proust and Flaubert as climax, as being the supreme reward, is indeed pathetic. Do all Cornish people cry as much as the people in Mr. Rowse's circle? Tears seem a constant accompaniment.

Although we cannot but be amused by the convert's enthusiasm, it is gratifying to learn that the Britisher can receive, even if he does not deserve, the high praise of Mr. Rom Landau's *The Fool's Paradise* (Faber, 5s.). Perhaps this is why this appealed to us more than the writer's previous books, though he still is very dogmatic and he talks of "Virginia Woolfe". Starting from the reactions of Polish airmen in this country, Mr. Landau discusses British characteristics: honesty, revealed in such ways as leaving pennies for newspapers, depositing and collecting luggage for railway vans without receipts, impressed our visitors most of all. See "Worth Noting".

We imagine that when some readers reach the end—on p. 944—of Miss Bradda Field's *Miledi* (Constable, 18s.) they will feel they have been sold, for the story of Lady Hamilton breaks off at an exciting moment with the promise of another instalment. And 18s. is a lot to pay for an instalment. Long as the book is, it is only rarely, when it comes to details of Neapolitan politics, that it ceases to grip. Miss Field can both paint a portrait and describe a scene, and minor characters live as well as major. We cannot but feel, however, that she would have been wiser to conclude Emma's story in one volume, even at the expense of some detailed history. This is the first of Miss Field's books we have met; we look forward to reading others—already written and to be written—where she is unencumbered by history.

Perhaps the best tribute we can pay to Dr. T. R. Glover's *The Challenge of the Greek* (Cambridge Press, 12s. 6d.) is that while when we began it our intention was to give it away, we marked so many things that the volume now has a permanent place on our shelves. To knowledge and enthusiasm Dr. Glover adds a pretty wit and a *flair* for relating classical times to our own, all in a delightful style which is most disarming when he is most dangerous. The volume opens with the B.B.C. National Lecture, "The Challenge of the Greek", and the Presidential Address to the Classical Association, both of them emphasizing that freedom in thought and spirit which is as essential to life today as in the days of Plato. Half-a-dozen charming essays on things Greek follow, while "Team or Hero?" is

packed with excellent counsel. Finally there are commemoration appreciations of Virgil and Erasmus.

We always have the same impression in reading Miss Hilda D. Oakeley's work—that she has something vital to say, but does not quite manage to say it. Instead of walking on firm ground we seem to be in undergrowth, or, to change the figure, while Miss Oakeley is sure of her destination as the vessel forges its way ahead, the passengers are often only conscious of ploughing the waves and heavy weather. Here is the argument of *Should Nations Survive?* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.):

> How is the nation as we know it today, and as we review the part it has played in history, to be purified, so that as a social institution it will become only a power for good, freed from the evils which have attended nationalistic developments? The thesis which has been maintained is that these evils belong primarily to the association of the nation with the state, especially in the modern period, until it has become in certain communities the monstrosity from whose madness the world is suffering today. It is this which is the greatest political evil of the times. But it is the reappearance in our midst of an ancient evil.

Miss Oakeley has many fine quotations and pregnant sentences; maybe a second reading will make the argument clearer.

Mr. Lionel Gelber's **Peace by Power* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.) is like a plunge into a cold bath. Emotional idealists and class-room theorists are made to face reality: Mr. Clarence Streit's volumes are dubbed "so naïve, so rapt, and so unimpressive". Mr. Gelber refuses to allow critics of national sovereignty, of the Versailles Treaty, and the like to escape with easy generalizations; especially does he resist criticism of the "balance of power" in Europe, for in it he finds the *sine qua non* for future peace. "Mastery of the sea lanes and the balance of power in Europe are indivisible", he maintains, and they are the basis of a new world order. Readers must find for themselves the place assigned to Germany in that order, and they will receive salutary criticism in the process:

> For in its insistence upon standards of perfection it [a whole generation] created a meaningless world of moral nihilism through which aggressors strode with impunity.
>
> All kinds of capitalism, together with all kinds of sovereignty are arraigned; the charge is a blanket-charge with no varying degrees of innocence or guilt. And it is this sort of thing against which the democracies must be alert; the influence on the peacemaking of partisan propaganda which pronounces serenely and *ex cathedra* on historical questions without historical proof.

See "Worth Noting" for an extract from a timely and forthright book.

From Gollancz come five small volumes. Mr. Sidney Dark's *The Red Bible* (5s.) is an anthology from the Bible, including the *Apocrypha*, arranged under eight heads, such as "The Sin of Usury" and "The Deceitfulness of Riches". Mattathias has "ts" enough without being given another one (p. 128). Two books reply to Lord Vansittart. With their main contentions we are in agreement, but *Guilty Germans?* (6s.), by Mr. Aubrey Douglas Smith, "resident tutor in Essex of the University of Cambridge", will, we fear, serve only to annoy: in his endeavour to dissociate the Germans from the Nazis he often closes his eyes, but opens them wide to discover all the sins of Britain and the British, while failing to mention significant facts like the restoration of self-government to the South African

peoples in 1907; abuse of capitalists, sneers at all who disagree, biased reading of history, with careful selection of facts—these will drive many readers from the conclusion the resident tutor wishes them to reach. A good deal of the same ground is covered in Mr. Victor Gollancz's *Shall Our Children Live or Die?* (2s. 6d.). Mr. Gollancz is nothing if not confident, and he is often right, but surely he did not expect the Atlantic Charter to contain a blue-print of a post-war Socialist State. Sir Richard Acland's *What It Will Be Like in the New Britain* (3s. 6d.) is much more reasonable in temper: it outlines the "Common Ownership" its author desiderates after the war, goes into details, and meets objections. Its plan for "economic liberty" for everyone is attractive, but we found the chapter on "The Small Man" unconvincing. Sir Richard also writes Part II ("Our Policy Now") of *The Winning of the Peace* (3s. 6d.), Part I of which is written by Herr Heinrich Fraenkel. Here he applies the idea of "Common Ownership" to post-war Germany, while insisting that an Allied victory will come more quickly if "we can show the German people that our victory does not mean their slavery". Herr Fraenkel, who gives an excellent criticism of the B.B.C.'s foreign broadcasts, thus sums up his argument:

> Goebbels has one real trump-card; he pulls it out every day; it is his one and only potent trump-card; it spells: we-must-now-sink-or-swim-together. Knock that card out of his hand, and you've won the battle, we've all won it! But don't expect the German people to upset the apple-cart, so long as you threaten them with hell's damnation rather than some hope for the future.

With the best will in the world we cannot tell what Mr. J. Middleton Murry is after in *Christocracy* (Dakers, 6s.), a title which he has to set out to justify two pages from the end of his book. In his justification he announces that "A society in which Imagination is an effective reality is a society in which Christ is Lord". Now we believe in Christocracy, as we do in most of the things Mr. Murry desires—toleration, the recognition of the value of the individual soul, creative work for every man, even socialism, though probably we should not define socialism in the same way. It is Mr. Murry's cocksureness which irritates most—about past, present, and future. He has so much to say that is salutary that it is a pity he is so dogmatic—it is really possible for an intelligent man to believe that socialism is not "a necessary development of democracy", and to hold that "Britain represents the good, while Hitler represents the evil" is not necessarily "a nationalistic delusion". Statesmen and Churchmen alike come under the lash; Hitler is probably treated more kindly than anybody else!

Although Mr. Edward Mousley castigates many and praises—or patronizes—few, his *The Democratic Advance* (Dakers, 6s.) ought to be read. It is specially good in outlining "the Hitler dynamic" and "the democratic dynamic" which must resist and overcome it. This finds its expression in a "United States of Democracy", a new democratic order whose features are sketched in the concluding chapters.

Mr. Douglas Reed's *All Our Tomorrows* (Cape, 10s. 6d.) gives the impression of a man in a state of chronic bad-temper. While we are not disposed to quarrel with his criticism of the men of Munich, we become tired of the reiterated abuse which fills these pages: it is not necessary to shout all the time at the top of one's voice to convince hearers; indeed, the reverse is often the result. Mr. Reed opens with a very clever Prologue; if its wit could have been sustained throughout, the book would have been his best instead of his weakest: some of the chapters are mere padding, and if Mr. Reed talked to uneducated women in the way he suggests, his intelli-

gence, his sense of fitness, and his sense of humour must have been asleep. This appears also in his anti-Jewish complex, where again his vituperation will prevent consideration of the points he has to make. Descriptive gifts Mr. Reed possesses, and with much of what he has to say we concur. But invective cannot be sustained with effect for 300 pages: the attempt to do it harms the cause he has at heart.

Another towel steeped in ice-cold water, please, that we may tackle again Herr Karl Otten's *A Combine of Aggression* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.), the sub-title of which is "Masses, Élite, and Dictatorship in Germany". The Preface warns us that the book was written in German for Germans, and speaks of "the heaviness and density of its style". Whether the warning was necessary may be gauged from the author's claim that he has

> succeeded in proving that the Prussian illusion, its myth and its planned lay-out, that New Germanism and the æsthetics of the Petty Bourgeois—from the pacifism of the professors to the terrorism of a Clausewitz or a Schlieffen—constitute a lesser, an inferior, complex, constitute a crystallization of pseudologisms. We believe that we have succeeded in proving that the aspirations of the "efficient Germans" conceal the will of an élite, striving to make the world believe in the illusion of force, in order to subjugate and to exploit it, in accordance with a carefully conceived plan.

This illusion

> must succumb to the ascendancy of the "Good Illusion" of justice and of the individual's and the masses' right to self-determination. . . . The victory of the democracies will compel the Germans to relinquish their murder-impulses and to discard the rule of their Prussian warrior-caste. This compulsion, in its consummate indispensableness, stands on a level with every true cultural achievement; maybe on a level with the greatest cultural achievements of European mankind.
>
> The Germans themselves, however, will have to conquer and to subjugate the power-impulse of the economic planners, whose primary importance and meaning as the "élite of the specialists" we have elucidated; the Germans themselves will have to control this impulse, once it has been conquered, and to subordinate it to the plan of their peaceful will to work.

So far as can be judged the Axis has beaten the Allies in the field of propaganda; indeed, some of our rulers do not even yet appear to have realized the need for education—or, if you will, propaganda—at home and abroad. Dr. Otto Friedmann's *Broadcasting for Democracy* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.) analyses the Nazi propaganda policy, and then discusses how democratic methods should differ. Another useful little book.

It is a pity that the able papers Mr. G. D. H. Cole, Mr. Francis Williams, Mr. Harold Laski, and Miss Mary Sutherland contribute to *Victory or Vested Interest?* (Routledge, 5s.) are accompanied by a superficial harangue by Mr. George Orwell, even though he spells better than some of the others. Mr. Williams's "Equality of Sacrifice" and Mr. Laski's "Democracy in War-time" are pertinent and searching.

In *Palestine: A Policy* (Methuen, 7s.) Mr. Albert M. Hyamson, who has been Director of Immigration in Palestine, surveys the intractable Arab-Jew problem from the Zionist point of view. His account of the history of the Zionist movement is useful, especially in the later stages, but the title promises more than the book really performs. The "policy" is that of federation between Palestine and the surrounding States, but Mr. Hyamson

scarcely faces up to the difficulties. In spite of this, it is probably along these lines that the solution of the *impasse* will be found.

The value of the visit of Sir Stafford Cripps to India was in the resulting education of people the world over in the nature of the India problem and the sincerity of the British offer to meet it: many eyes were opened which had long been fast closed by ignorance and prejudice. Prof. R. Coupland's *The Cripps Mission* (Oxford Press, 1s.) should be spread far and wide.

We trust that in spite of the difficulties of the times many churches will persist in the "Family Church" experiment, and give full trial to the *Christian Education Handbooks*. The Primary, Junior, and Intermediate Courses for the second year are now ready (Indep. Press, 4s. each).

It is far from easy to learn the truth about the Church in Russia today: a fact-finding group working under the chairmanship of Prof. John Macmurray is finding it difficult to gather accurate knowledge. Mr. Serge Bolshakoff's *The Christian Church and the Soviet State* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) is therefore welcome, although obviously it is an *ex parte* statement. Christians in this country must use their best efforts to ensure that the present alliance with Russia results in full religious toleration; despite what Father Bolshakoff says, the record of the Orthodox Church in Russia is probably the main obstacle.

Publishers must wonder how the *Christian News-Letter* "gets away with it". *Real Life is Meeting* (S.P.C.K., 1s. 6d.) contains 7 Supplements, five by Dr. J. H. Oldham and one each by Prof. H. A. Hodges and Mr. Philip Mairet, reprinted with 6 virgin white pages surrounding them. The papers are searching and stimulating, though as often with the *C.N.-L.* we have the impression that the writers would be much more convincing if you felt they could smile at themselves—or at anybody else! Granted that *joie de vivre* is hard to come by in these days, yet it is only if Christians have joy in the spiritual warfare to which the *C.N.-L.* calls them that they will be able to win through to victory.

Mr. Wickham Steed can do some things very well, and therefore there is all the more reason that the shoemaker should stick to his last. *That Bad Man* (Macmillan, 5s.) shows that his *rôle* is not that of writer for young people, many of whom will be baffled by this life-story of Hitler. But it will do older people no harm to read the amazing tale once again.

Mr. W. R. Brock's *Lord Liverpool and Liberal Toryism* (Cambridge Press, 8s. 6d.) is a competent Thirlwall Prize Essay. It aims at proving—and on the whole it succeeds—that Liverpool's premiership reveals him to be much more than the dull and colourless nonenity of many of the histories. It was only by Liverpool, claims Mr. Brock, that the Government —"ultras" and Liberal Tories—were kept together, and on his death it speedily resolved into its elements. He was largely responsible for its economic policy, and so far from being dominated in foreign affairs by his brilliant subordinate, Canning, he shared most of that genius's views and often protected him from his assailants.

Miss D. M. Stuart always writes well, and *The Mother of Queen Victoria* (Macmillan, 15s.) is a fitting successor to *The Daughters of George the Third*. Miss Stuart's solution of the problem presented by the character of the Duchess of Kent is that for ten years the real woman was "occluded" (a favourite word) and that the aggressive schemer of 1827-1837 was the result of Conroy's influence. Miss Stuart evidently does not regard the relationship between the Duchess and her Comptroller as a guilty one; nevertheless he and Lehzen are the villains of the period piece, responsible

as they were for the eight years' rupture between Victoria and her mother. The chapters on the Duchess's happy years after 1840 are well done: those years are often forgotten.

Told, and well told, in the form of the autobiography of Renate Feldt, half-Jewish daughter of a German writer murdered in a concentration camp, Miss Ruth Feiner's *Young Woman of Europe* (Dakers, 9s. 6d.) is a vivid account of life in Hitlerite Germany and wartime Britain. The tragic lot of people without a country, of refugees longing to fight against Hitlerism and prevented from doing so by suspicion arising from their nationality, leaves the English reader uncomfortable.

Mr. Arthur Waley has done a remarkably successful piece of work in *Monkey* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.), a translation from the Chinese of Wu Ch'êng-ên, who lived in the 16th century. Whether we think of *Monkey* as a Chinese *Pilgrim's Progress* or as a novel or as a fairy tale, Mr. Waley has made it so readable that it does not need the inducement to read on which ends each chapter. Tripitaka, the ordinary man, does not appear to advantage, but Monkey is very attractive. On two occasions we thought Mr. Waley had transliterated words—*cerenomy* and *humdred*—but we were mistaken: it was only the printer.

EDITOR.

Dr. Edward Langton's *Good and Evil Spirits* (S.P.C.K., 15s.) is a comprehensive and very detailed study, on comparative lines, of the evidence to be gathered from the literature of general anthropology and from the Bible (including the Apocryphal and Apocalyptic literature). The treatment is historical and interpretative, and does not, except incidentally, deal with the theological and philosophical issues. The author shows a wide and competent knowledge of the very extensive literature, and his interpretation of the evidence is usually judicious and convincing. Those with special knowledge of particular parts of the field will naturally differ sometimes from his conclusions. For example, in the realm of Hebrew psychology, the writer does not seem to be aware of the important fact that *ruach* (spirit) was not used as a psychical constituent of human personality before the exile. The consequence is that the alleged original "trichotomy" asserted by Charles and others, loses one of its elements. As for the "soul", the Hebrew emphasis falls on the body (flesh) as the essential personality animated by a more or less transient "breath-soul". This is in sharp contrast with the Greek conception of "soul" as the true personality, temporarily dwelling in a material "prison". It is therefore wrong to speak even of a Hebrew dichotomy (as distinct from later developments). However, particular criticisms of this kind need not affect our judgment on the book as a whole. It will take a recognized place as a useful review of the psychological and eschatological data of belief in spirits, demons and angels. But it is a book for the student, rather than for the general reader, who would find its necessary detail wearisome.

Dr. T. Hywel Hughes's *Psychology and Religious Truth* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is an expansion of lectures given to theological students at Bangor last year, but it is written without undue technicality, and will appeal to most ministers as a competent and readable introduction to a now familiar subject. There is nothing novel in its conclusions. The author deals with the origin of religion, and here concentrates chiefly on the spiritual need involved in the primary instinct of self-preservation. He shows that this subjective approach ought not to be prejudicial to the full objectivity of reality in the idea of God. In the study of the formation of character the place of conversion is fully recognized. In the assimilation of truth, the

emphasis falls on its intrinsic self-evidence as the ground of its authority. The additional matter (not given as part of the original lectures) dealing with the Trinity, the Incarnation, Sin and Atonement, and the Future Life, includes interesting suggestions for the presentation of these doctrines, but can, of course, profess to be no more than a psychological approach to them. It constantly tempts the author to stray beyond his brief into the theology and philosophy from which psychology must always find its completion. It would be unfortunate if these brief chapters were taken as adequate treatments of the doctrines in question. The author reminds us (perhaps almost too frequently) of the limitations of psychology, both as a discipline and in regard to its present degree of attainment. The proof-reading has been carelessly done, and the punctuation is annoyingly bad.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

When C. F. Andrews went back to India for the last time in 1937 he planned to write a life of Christ. What he did write was this characteristic exposition of *The Sermon on the Mount* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.). Even this was an uncompleted task, covering only the first half of *Matthew's* three chapters. Andrews pays grateful tribute to Bishop Gore's work on the same subject, but handles the themes in his own distinctive way. As we should expect, it is a devout and saintly study, and the Appendix on "First Aids to Prayer" should be helpful to many. There is a beautiful tribute to the author in the Foreword by his friend and fellow-worker Rabindranath Tagore.

There are books whose intention is better than their execution and of such is *The Ever-present Kingdom* (Dakers, 3s. 6d.), the joint work of H. W. Workman and G. F. Mowatt, plus Foreword and Preface from two other contributors. The general purpose of the book is apparently the application of the Gospel of the Kingdom to bodily as well as spiritual needs, in other words "divine healing". Though rather discursive there are some good things in it, including a note on the theory of the pre-mundane fall.

A work pronounced good by such judges as H. G. Wood and W. F. Howard is well worth consideration. Dr. G. H. Boobyer in *St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story* (Clark, 6s.) has produced a workmanlike study of this particular episode in the Gospel narrative, which is a model of what such monographs should be. The argument is carried forward in an orderly way and the documentation is full and accurate. While the Transfiguration is for *Mk.* a divine confirmation of the Messiahship of Jesus, its reference is not to His heavenly exaltation or to the glory of the resurrection, but to the parousia. The details of the story are shown to fit this theory, a theory found also in other early Christian writings, *e.g., The Apocalypse of Peter.*

There is so much that is useful, interesting, and honest in Archibald Robinson's *The Bible and its Background* (Watts: 2 vols., 2s. each) that it is a pity the writer's standpoint is so obsolete. He rejects the Bible as a "sacred book", which leaves us wondering if there is any collection of writings that merits that title. Vol. I is a sketch of ancient history with apposite quotations from *O.T.*, but might have more definitely outlined the development of the idea of God among the Hebrew people. In Vol. II (*N.T.*) the treatment of documents is not so well done as in the case of *O.T.*, and we are led off into discussions on Myth and History, Messianists and Gnostics. "The Gospels are a wish-fulfilling myth of God made man".

Mr. Wallace Beeny's idea of *Religion made Easy* (Rider, 7s. 6d.) is to dispense with the Christian religion altogether. After showing where

Christianity is wrong and how it has brought hell upon earth, he presents us with a tabular guide to good conduct consisting of seven primary and twelve secondary virtues—or duties (over against which are set seven fundamental and fourteen secondary "sins"), the observance of which will give mankind the means to achieve a Magnificent Destiny. Hedonism up-to-date—or out of date.

Written obviously for members of his own communion, C. J. Wilmot's *The Priest's Prayer Book: a handbook to the Breviary* (Burns, Oates, 7s. 6d.) will be found useful to ministers in general, who will easily discern between what is and is not specifically Roman. Out of a long and varied experience the writer has come to know the sins that so easily trip us up, and his counsel, covering every aspect of the ministerial life, is pertinent and sane, *e.g.*, the meditation on life and health (p. 69), and that on public speaking (p. 124), as well as those on the deeper issues.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

Among the recent additions to the "Searchlight Series" (Secker & Warburg, 2s.) is a book by Mr. Olaf Stapledon with the rather cryptic title, *Beyond the 'isms*. It is on the perennial subject of reconstruction after the war. People are tired of loud-sounding words ending in 'ism and want something simpler, more direct, and positive. This Mr. Stapledon seeks to supply with a doctrine of spirit or personality. Recent history shows quite clearly that what the world needs is not political or economic readjustment, but a new spirit. This neither religious orthodoxy nor scientific materialism is able to supply. There must be a re-birth of humanity through the recovery of the central Christian experiences, the love of man, and the love of truth. Much that Mr. Stapledon writes is very true and helpful, and his criticism of the existing order is fully justified. But he is all the time trying to keep the Christian values without the dynamic of the Christian gospel, and it cannot be done. His system is nothing more or less than a glorified humanism, and to go out beyond the 'isms with no better equipment than this is to wander in a wilderness of one's own making.

In *The Awakening of Western Legal Thought* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) Dr. Max Hamburger brings in the old world to redress the balance of the new. He believes that

> the intellectual greatness of antiquity which turned barbarians into civilized human beings, the ethical and political meditations of the ancients, which have created a civilizing influence on the legal and social life of humanity, should give us support in a world in which nothing certain remains but the fact that technique can do something other than merely serve humanity.

Accordingly in the first part of his book he sums up the teaching of the ancients, mainly Greek and Roman, on morals and politics, and in the second part seeks to apply it to the needs of the present time. The first part consists largely of quotations, many of them from comparatively unknown writers, but impressive in their testimony as to the need for law and justice in all human relations. The second part points the moral for a world torn by war and in danger of slipping back into barbarism. The book has been well translated by Mr. Bernard Miall, and is a vital and interesting contribution on a great subject. W. B. SELBIE.

At times we are apt to wonder for what age of reader Mr. L. A. G. Strong has written his *House in Disorder* (Lutterworth Press, 7s. 6d.). But the story of the three boys Gordon, Tony, and Oliver, and their adventures at Stony Peak, maintains its interest and will provide lively reading for fifteen and sixteen year olds. MARGARET PEEL.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

MR. C. S. LEWIS'S *Broadcast Talks* (Centenary Press, 2s. 6d.) reprints addresses from two series, *Right and Wrong,* and *What Christians Believe.* Dr. Enid Smith's *Marriage and Home-making* and Dr. William Brown's *Psychological Problems of Later Life* (Alliance of Honour, 6d. & 3d.) are helpful. Mr. A. G. Whyte's *The Riddle of Religious Education and a New Solution* (Watts, 6d.) argues that, the logical "secular" solution being impossible at the moment, "religion" should be widely interpreted to include all religions, and treated historically. The Statement of the Commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility, *The Christian Church and World Order* (S.C.M., 4s.), should be closely studied. The Rev. A. McLeish's *Burma: Christian Progress to the Invasion* (World Dominion, 9d.) and Mr. J. H. Stembridge's *Atlas of the U.S.S.R.* (Oxford Press, 4d.) are timely. Mr. Alexander Miller's *The National Average* (Shadwell Group, 3d.) is a study in social discipline, showing how by personal and group discipline individuals can limit their spending to a national average. Miss Margaret Cole's *Education for Democracy* (Allen & Unwin, 2s.) is a report for the Fabian Society, Mr. Sidney Dark's *Letter to a Country Clergyman* (Fabian Society, 2d.) an attempt to carry "Malvern" into the villages, and Mr. Arthur Rogers's *Planning our New World* (Liberty Restoration League, 6d.) an individualist "Open Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury". From Indep. Press come four pamphlets — the Rev. H. J. S. Guntrip's useful *What Is Congregationalism?* (1½d.), the Rev. F. Stafford's *Christian Marriage* (2d.), which might have been franker with advantage, and Miss Muriel Lester's *Training* (4d.) and *Let Your Soul Catch Up with Your Body* (2d.): these were written in the United States, where Miss Lester probably irritated more people than she helped! The reverse should be true with these suggestions for a disciplined life.

NEW EDITIONS.

THE Friends' Book Centre has reprinted (2s. & 1s.) *Christian Life, Faith, and Thought in the Society of Friends,* being the first part of *Christian Discipline.* Dr. William Brown's *War and the Psychological Conditions of Peace* (Black, 7s. 6d.) contains his *War and Peace* (1939) plus three additional papers and a misprint on p. 125. His contention, still discounted by his admiration for Mr. Neville Chamberlain, is that Hitler is hysterical and a paranoid, and that Germany's treatment after the War must take account of the fact that since 1918 she has been

> a mentally sick nation, and is now in a state of atavistic regression under the rule of a cunning and unscrupulous individual of paranoid type.

ALSO RECEIVED.

W. M. F. SCOTT. *The Hidden Mystery.* Lutterworth Press. 1s. 6d. Bible Readings in *Ephesians* given at a C.M.S. Summer School.

GEOFFREY HOYLAND. *Sermons in Shorts.* S.C.M. 3s. 6d. 16 good talks to Prep. School boys by the former Headmaster of The Downs School, Colwall.

Songs for Today. Oxford Press. 8d. A selection by an Army Chaplain of 75 hymns "heralding the world of tomorrow", each prefixed by an extract from a speech.

GOTHIAN. *The Woman at the Well.* Dakers. 5s.

MORRIS H. TURK. *They Live.* Allen & Unwin. 3s. 6d. The first appearance in England of a book of comfort by a well-known American Congregational minister, now deceased.

LESLIE F. CHURCH. *Yonder—A Book for the Bereaved.* Epworth Press. 1s. An anthology.

"ALLAN JUNIOR". 4 "Golden Thoughts" Booklets. Valentine. 6d. each.

CYRIL SCOTT. *The Christian Paradox.* Rider. 8s. 6d.

SIR JAMES PURVES-STEWART. *Over Military Age.* Allen & Unwin. 6s.

BRIAN L. GANDON. *Halt! Major Road Ahead!* Pickering. 2s. 6d.
F. L. LUCAS. *Critical Thought in Critical Days;* BONAMY DOBREE, *The Unacknowledged Legislator.* Two P.E.N. books. Allen & Unwin. 2s.
PAUL SELVER. *Czechoslovak Literature.* Allen & Unwin. 2s. 6d. A very useful outline.
BARBARA WARD. *Turkey.* Oxford Press. 2s. 6d. "The World Today" series.
DOROTHY J. BIGGS. *Put on Your Armour.* Livingstone Press. 1s. 6d. "Discoveries, No. 1, from China. Stories, Lessons and Projects for Leaders of Boys and Girls".
J. ROLAND EVANS. *Blue Peter.* Carey Press. 2s. A boys' story about William Carey in England.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

The London Quarterly and Holborn (July). Interesting articles are the Rev. H. S. Darby's "The Conduct of Worship", Dr. A. W. Harrison's "The Belief in the Holy Spirit", the Rev. N. J. McLellan's "The Revolt against Sectarianism", and "The Hebrew Prophet and the Poet", by the Rev. W. Bardsley Brash, who also contributes a moving letter from an R.A.F. pilot, since killed in action, to his parents. We must confess that the review section made us long for "an hour of Peake".

The Hibbert Journal (July). Dr. Inge in a dialogue discusses "Miracle, Myth and Mystery", Mr. Stephen Hobhouse and Dr. Gregor Smith "Retribution", and Dr. N. Bishop Harman "Resurrection". Mr. Hamilton Fyfe asks "Why Is Man Unhappy?", and his contention that France fell because of lubricity is answered by Sir John Pollock. Two Congregational contributors are Dr. Selbie ("The Theological Colleges and Religious Education") and Dr. Buckham ("The Place of Faith in Philosophy"). The articles are shorter, and the surveys of recent philosophical and theological literature much less adequate than usual.

The Layman (July). Dr. E. L. Allen on "Christianity in Japan", and the Rev. E. W. Burt on "By-products of Christian Missions in China" precede articles on Baptist policies and personalities at home.

Religion in Education (July). This journal is now to appear three times a year instead of four. The Editor expresses what he deems "a cross-bench view" on the dual system; it is not clear what it is, except that now we have an "overwhelming" opportunity. The Rev. R. A. Edwards is severe on the *A.V.,* Dr. Grensted discusses "God: II, The Son", and Prof. De Burgh "Faith and Reason".

The Evangelical Quarterly (July). Mr. F. F. Bruce has the central place with "Some Aspects of Gospel Introduction", which *N.T.* scholars should not overlook.

The Expository Times (June-Aug). Despite all the problems of the paper shortage, this monthly maintains its usual features and its usefulness.

The International Review of Missions (July). A very good number opens with three important articles—Dr. K. S. Latourette's "Recessions in the Tide of Christian Advance", Dr. Nicol Macnicol's "Some Deductions from a Missionary's Experience", and Miss E. M. Holding's "Women's Institutions and the African Church". Other articles deal with the colour bar, Christian literature, Christian missions and Governments, and the need for evangelistic missionaries.

World Dominion (July-August). To timely articles on India by Sir Alfred Watson and the Rev. Alexander McLeish we refer in the Editorial. Well-known missionaries like Dr. Cochrane, the Rev. Herbert Anderson, and the Rev. E. W. Burt draw on their experiences, Mr. Sydney H. Moore writes on "The School's Opportunity", and there are the usual surveys.

The Common Room (July). All engaged in the Youth Movement would be well advised to glance at this issue of the periodical of the Educational Settlements Association.

Bulletin of John Rylands Library (May-June). Prof. Charlton has another delightful Shakespeare Lecture, this time on "Hamlet", Dr. T. Fish prints some interesting "Letters from the War Front in Ancient Mesopotamia", and Prof. T. H. Pear's "Psychological Aspects of English Social Stratification" is suggestive. Dr. T. W. Manson discusses the Corinthian Correspondence, Dr. Edward Robertson the Priestly Code, and Dr. Guppy the Discovery of the New World. Then we have some Cheshire Seals (12th-17th Century) and Dr. E. F. Jacob's "The Collapse of France in 1419-20".

Religion and Life (Summer). The Rev. Edwin Espy estimates "The Church's Debt to Hitler". Principal W. Hamilton Fyfe writes on "Social Reconstruction in Great Britain", the Rev. J. S. Stewart on "The New Order and the New Covenant",

Dr. W. E. Orchard on "Christ as a School of Culture", and Prof. Basil Mathews on "Should Missions Go On?" Dr. Jesse Bader's account of Christian Ashrams is interesting. Among other contributors are Dr. W. M. Horton and Dr. C. C. Richardson.

Agenda (July). This is No. 3 of a "quarterly journal of reconstruction" published by the London School of Economics (Oxford Press, 6s.—or 21s. yearly). The articles and contributors' names suggest the review's quality: "The Inevitable League" (Prof. Gilbert Murray); "Some Thoughts on Reconstruction" (Dr. C. R. S. Harris); "The Future of Information Services" (Mr. R. B. McCallum); "The Collection of Population Statistics" (Dr. E. C. Rhodes); "United States Foreign Trade Policy" (Mr. E. F. Schumacher); "Agriculture in Soviet Russia and Post-War Needs" (Sir John Russell). The Surveys of Research Work are continued.

The Harvard Theological Review (April). Three good articles are Mr. R. M. Grant's "The Fourth Gospel and the Church", Prof. J. S. Bixler's study of William James's *Moral Equivalent of War,* and Mr. H. A. Wolfson's "Philo on Free Will".

The Review of Religion (May). 64 pp. of this issue are given to reviews by an able body of reviewers. There are four articles, Prof. Derk Bodde's "The Chinese View of Immortality", Prof. C. H. Moehlman's "Catholicism Revises Its N.T.", Prof. James Muilenberg's "Imago Dei", and Prof. H. W. Schneider's "Sin and Society".

Theological Studies (May). Father Bluett's bibliography of articles in periodicals (1890-1940) on "The Mystical Body of Christ" will be very useful. Father McGinley continues the study of Form Criticism. Dr. T. J. McMahon sees in the *De Deo Uno* of J. A. Masdeu (1739-1810) 'a distant herald" of the *Aeterni Patris* of Leo XIII. Father Vollert writes on "Hervaeus Natalis [14th c.] and Original Justice".

The Review and Expositor (April). Two "Founders' Day" addresses, a comparison of Calvinism and Armihianism, a lecture, "Religion in Cross Section", on "The Religion of the Psalmists", and a racy and invigorating, if not always accurate, talk to preachers by Dr. F. F. Brown.

The Review and Expositor (July). As usual we find Dr. G. S. Dobbins's "Facing Pastoral Problems"—this time "Pastoral Leadership for Wartime"—the most helpful contribution. Nearly 50 pp. of book reviews.

The Yale Review (Summer). Prof. H. A. DeWeerd on "The Emergence of Coalition War" is informing, and so is Prof. C. Panunzio's "Italian Americans, Fascism, and the War". Prof. M. Rostovtzeff tells from his own experience at Dura on the Euphrates "How Archæology aids History", and Mr. Mark Schorer has a fascinating article on William Blake.

In Extremis (Mar.-May). The most important articles are Dr. Visser 't Hooft's *Die Not der Kirche u. die Oekumene* (since published separately) and Prof. W. Lüthi's *Die Bewährung des Glaubens in der Gegenwart.* There is a sermon by Pasteur E. Jeanneret entitled *Pâques: le Rire de Dieu,* a consideration of *Théologie barthienne et philosophie* by M. P. Thévenaz, and a revaluation of *Pestalozzis Glauben* by Prof. F. Huber.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE REAL IMPEDIMENT TO REUNION.

SIR,

(1) It would be both interesting and instructive to know what comment in detail Free Churchmen would have to make on a statement by a recent reviewer in the *Times Lit. Sup.* (13 June): "Experience shows that where the Priesthood of the individual is the prevailing consideration, the supernatural and mystical essence of the Christian religion tends to evaporate or be stifled". Lest we should be left in any doubt as to his meaning, the writer goes on to add in the next sentence: "The early development of the episcopal, sacramental, credal Church preserved and protected the faith in the Exalted Christ and the Spirit which inspires the society and individual alike". For ourselves the reply that came immediately to mind was the statement of no less a person than Lightfoot: "The Kingdom of Christ has no sacerdotal system" (*Epistle to the Philippians,* 179). Can it be true of

the present generation of Free Church and Anglican Evangelical theologians that "the study of evangelical theology is only interesting as showing what were the truths in the formal theology which appealed most strongly to the emotional moods" (A. V. G. Allen, *The Continuity of Christian Thought,* 1884, 377)?

(2) The point raised, however, not only discloses the present impasse in the relations between the Church of England and the Free Churches but has also the singular merit of moving the whole question of reunion out of the interminable debate of insular shibboleths into the larger room of theological discussion. It will obviously be a manifest gain if we can keep in the clear light of day and discuss in "a cool hour" those differences between the Church of England and the Free Churches which have a real theological basis and are not, as too often seems the case, merely psychologically conditioned on quite other grounds. The assertion, furthermore, is a challenge Anglican Evangelicals are as anxious as Free Churchmen to rebut. But perhaps the chief value of the words is to suggest that the time has arrived for a more dynamic approach to the whole reunion issue and one that will lift it out of the present state of deadlock and stagnation.

(3) One of the most subtle of theological problems—part of the almost unexplored field of the whole psychology of belief itself—is to define the precise relationship between belief and worship. There is so much more to be said than Bushnell's facile definition of Christian doctrine as "formulated Christian experience". It is equally impossible to exaggerate the practical implications of the answer we give. With this proviso we may say in a general way that to the modern Evangelical, both Anglican and Free Church, liturgical form is the offspring of a rule of faith. Is it an exaggeration to say that elsewhere the position is reversed and that belief waits upon liturgy? Here surely is the real crux of the unending conflict between the *ethos* of Evangelicalism and of "Catholicism". It is a deflating, if salutary, truth for the theologian to remember that he is seldom used as a pioneer in things of doctrine, and that in these non-theological days in which we live his *rôle* cannot often be a creative one. Like the University, he best performs the task of a censor and critic of doctrine rather than its dynamic nucleating centre. Worship, not doctrine—if we may summarize the issues so starkly and crudely—is the precious life blood of religion. Is not this a truth writ large across the whole history of doctrine? Is it not abundantly reflected in contemporary Christendom? Anglican Evangelicals and Free Churchmen alike have to awaken from their dogmatic slumber and realize this factual truth of history we can most summarily express by saying "Devotion decrees, doctrine defines, dogma defends".

The question thus arises, Can there be any profitable discussion of reunion unless *pari passu* more basic agreement is reached on the all important *imponderabilia* of our differing forms of worship? If reunion is to be an actual and not a fictional goal for pulpit and platform use only, is not the starting point here? *Solivitur ambulando.* The early Christians gathered round the one Lord's Table and yet what a bewildering galaxy there is in the names, to give only a few—*Coena Domini* (the Lord's Supper); *Sanctissimum* (the Holy of Holies); the *Eulogia* (the Blessing); the *Agape* (the Love Feast); the *Fractio Panis* (the Breaking of Bread); the *Synaxis* (the Assembly). Spiritual realism demands that we face squarely the inexpugnable fact that reunion discussion is largely futile unless and until we can give an affirmative answer to the prior question whether or no there is and is to be a growing *rapprochement* in devotional cultus between the Anglican and the Free Churches.

If we suggest that the time is ripe for this entirely fresh approach to reunion by implementing in the co-operative adventure of worship that definite measure of unity we have already attained in Christian doctrine, scholarship, and active witness, we are not unmindful that there need be nothing contradictory in the present uniformity of doctrine and liturgical variety between Anglican Evangelicals and Free Churchmen. This is even exultingly true. Yet at the same time can it be denied that some measure of liturgical agreement on "the supernatural and mystical essence of the Christian religion" would send a tidal wave of the spirit through the Churches against which all other obstacles would prove to be the merest wisps of straw? At least when we gather round the conference table—we have not learnt to kneel there yet!—let us not forget that worship is the dynamic of religion and that the chill of doctrine can never take its place as a creative force. And if, as is only too sadly true, the inertia in this vital matter of reunion lies with the solid phalanx of indifferent lay folk, here surely will be found the "repining restlessness" we need.

(4) Anglican Evangelicals have learnt much from their Free Church brethren, as the bookshelves in many a Rectory and Vicarage would proclaim. We have noticed, too, that High Churchly doctrine has never afforded any just cause or impediment to the appreciation of the sources of the best sermon pabulum! While there is among Anglican Evangelicals a faithful obedience to the Prayer Book office of the Holy Communion (save the occasional or frequent use of the 1928 Prayer Book version of the prayer for "The Church Militant"), much more liberty is enjoyed within the flexible framework of Morning and Evening Prayer than perhaps Free Churchmen have always realized or appreciated. During these last years we have moved on. We have long availed ourselves of freedom for intercession and extempore prayer after the Third Collect. There is a growing devotional use of silence for the uplifting of the heart in secret and among the faithful to the ever-adorable Saviour of men. When one looks at the framed portraits that gaze down from the walls of many an Anglican Vestry and remembers the sordid conflicts in past centuries within the boundaries of one's own parish, it is to realize how great has been our debt to the ideals of liberty in prophesying and of worship so rightly treasured among the Free Churches. How much we have yet to learn is another story. Let anyone try to find in the most popular Anglican Hymn Book a worthy hymn on the devotional meaning of the Sacred Scriptures.

(5) Have the Free Churches, too, nothing to learn? If Anglicans still need to be reminded that "Sermon and Scripture must be"—to use Dr. Carnegie Simpson's phrase—"the 'monstrance' wherein we recognize His presence and adore", have not Free Churchmen a new necessity laid upon them in these new days for a more overt and sacramental recognition of "the supernatural and mystical essence of the Christian religion" their theologians today have done so much to conserve? What do the differences in statistics of communicants and of opportunities of Holy Communion between the average Anglican Evangelical Church and the corresponding Free Church really *mean*? That the last word on reunion is worship and not doctrine? That, as Dr. John Oman said in his posthumous work, "perhaps denominations have been appointed just to prove whether our fellowship has a better way of recognizing one another than the repetition of shibboleths, and is Christian enough to embrace them"? The New Testament as usual speaks with the final word we *all* need, if not always desire: "the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now calleth all men everywhere to repent" (*Acts* 17^{30}).

Yours truly,

The Rectory, Darlaston. A. B. LAVELLE.

TRADITIONALISM AND MODERNISM.

SIR,

I welcome the conciliatory spirit of the article by Dr. Cadoux, and the letter by Mr. Bulcock, and desire to share it. There is a use of terms by the group which they represent against which a caveat must be entered. Dr. Cadoux describes those who differ from him as *traditional,* and those who agree with him as *liberal,* and it is claimed for the movement that it is *modern.* If a man accepts his convictions unexamined from the Church his position is *traditional*: he holds for himself what has been handed down, and that is his reason. Many a man, however, whose theology is much more conservative than is that of Dr. Cadoux or Mr. Bulcock, has reached his convictions by using his *liberty* of inquiry without prejudice or partiality; if, unbiased by *tradition,* he has "proved all things" in his experience, study, and reflexion, and holds "that which is good" in his more nearly orthodox convictions, he can claim to be *liberal.* So again he may be *modern* in his ready welcome for all well-attested conclusions of science in its own sphere and in being untroubled by any alleged conflict of religion with science, when each discharges its own function: he may have found deliverance from the difficulties and distresses of the "traditional" view of the Holy Scriptures in the use of the literary and historical criticism; his comparative study of the religions of the world may have led him to recognize a *general revelation* of God through nature and history to the religious consciousness, and yet to apprehend by the inward witness of the Holy Spirit *a special revelation* of God of unique value in these Holy Scriptures, and of incomparable authority in our Lord Jesus Christ. He may nevertheless deplore and feel no intellectual compulsion, or consequent moral or religious obligation to share the negations of *modernists.* My experience, study, and reflexion have led me to a theology which I claim to be no more traditional and no less liberal and modern than that of your two contributors.

Yours sincerely,

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA.

SIR,

In your July issue there appears a genial "Welcome Home" letter addressed to you by Dr. Grieve. I do not want to make such a note the basis of a controversial correspondence, but may I correct a wrong inference which is drawn in the second paragraph?

Dr. Grieve quotes a statement made by the Dewan Bahadur S. E. Runganadhan at the Annual L.M.S. Rally and by implication identifies the speaker with those who are opposed to the South India Scheme of Union. In fairness to our Indian guest it should be said that he is amongst those who look forward to the completion of the present Scheme. Mr. Runganadhan has written, "I do admire and believe in the principles of Congregationalism, but in the very peculiar conditions prevailing in India I am entirely in favour of a United Church such as is envisaged by the South India Scheme". I may add that Mr. Runganadhan, though nurtured in Congregationalism, has for some years been a member of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Yours sincerely,

NORMAN GOODALL.